

A MODEST
ANSWER
TO
Dr. *STILLINGFLEET'S*
IRENICUM:

By a Learned Pen.

*Sed hoc quidem affirmare non vereor, quod heu nimium tri-
bis Experientia jam pridem docuit, sensim inter eodem &
pari munere sacro fungentes, ordinem Divinum, in gra-
dum humanum, & hunc gradum, ruptis verorum puro-
rum Canonum vinculis, in tyrannidem manifestam, & si
restitutam Ecclesiam malumus, abolendam evasisse. Theod.
Bezæ Resp. ad Sarav. de Ministr. Evang. grad. cap.
15. a calce.*

LONDON,
Printed for Richard Janeway in Queens-Head-
 Alley in Water-noster-Row, 1680.

A MODEST

ANSWER

BY THE

Deputy

of the
County of
the State of
the County of
the State of

1800

1800

in
in
pad
th
an
in
W
on
on
an
th
ha



ADVERTISEMENT.

THe Reader is desired to Correct the Mistake of the Printer, in calling so Reverend an Antagonist by the name of Mr. *Stillingfleet*, instead of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in so great a part of the Book. And as for an Epistle, though there was one provided by another hand, yet an accident preventing its Publishing with the Book, the Writer thereof is much better satisfied, on second thoughts, with its suppression: finding it no easie matter to say any thing worthy of the renowned Author; and so Learned a Work, that hath had the perusal and approbation

* 2

of

of as worthy and skilful Divines in the
Controversie of Church-Government, as
are of their Age. *Judicium sit penes*
lectorem.

Animadver-

this ti
suppo
and to
making
instea
ment,
Be any
search
fares
of ma
termin
for fur
the wo
pointed
that he
are cat
shall b
who c
these,
have d
have a
up on i

*Animadversions on Dr. Stillingfleet's
Irenicum, &c.*

C H A P. I.

THIS Book, though set off with the specious Title of an *Irenicum*, and carrying in its Face the pretence of a Laudable Design, viz. the healing of the dangerous Wounds and sad Divisions of the Church at this time prevailing, will, upon due Examination, I suppose, be found an unsuitable Salve for these Sores, and to mend our rents, as they say *Tinkers* do, by making a greater rent instead of mending a lesser. For instead of a Debate about particular Forms of Government, it bringeth in another Debate, whether there be any Form instituted of Christ, whether we must search the will of Christ about managing Church-Affaires in his Word, or be content with what is the will of man? Which Controversie is like to be harder in determining, and more stiffly agitated than the other; for sure it is harder to perswade them, who would take the word of God for their rule, that *Christ hath not appointed any one Form of Government in his House*, than that *he hath not appointed this or that*. By this device we are cast loose of all hold where we may fix, and there shall be no end of Contention, at least among them, who consult so as to determine some one Form of all these, which are thought to be lawful; and when they have determined, the People, on whom they impose it, have a very unsure bottom to settle their Consciences upon in this matter, that doth so nearly concern Religion,

B

gion, to wit, nothing but the Judgment and Will of man, which is often wrong, and led by Interest, and the best is fallible and cannot guide us certainly in that which pleaseth God. Wherefore this Authors Opinion seems to be a cutting of the knot with *Alexander* and casting all loose, when he cannot so untie it, as to hold fast the exercise of Christ's Kingly Power in governing his Church. Neither is this Opinion new, as the Author seemeth to imply; for it was long since maintained, and largely propugned by Mr. *Hooker* in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, and solidly refuted by Mr. *Rutherford* in his *Divine Right of Church-Government* and indeed hath always been and still is the main Pillar to uphold Episcopacy in these Nations, it being the most ready and plausible way for them, who would wreath this Iron Yoke on the Necks of their Brethren when they cannot shew them Christ's Authority for it to take the determining of the Case out of his hands and to put it in the hand of the King, and then to pre-empt it from his Authority with Fire and Sword. And indeed this Opinion is a most colourable excuse for the unfaithful compliance of them, who would fain hold their places under any Form of Church-Government that shall lye uppermost; for so they shall be sure never to cross Authority, and not to cross the Interest of their own Back and Belly; and how much mischief this piece hath done this way, is too evident; seeing men that incline to comply, are satisfied with shadows instead of substantial reason, to put off troublesome Conscience. Yet among them, who are conscientious and zealous for any one way of Government, I suppose, the Lot of this Author will be that, which is ordinarily such unhappy Peace-Makers, as sell truth, or some part of it by an over-reach of condescendency, and that in Gods matters, not their own, (in which we may bargain as hard Merchants do in worldly things,) to be deemed peace; for I suppose men of all persuasions will be about his Ears: For that which I am persuaded

be the
Gover
ders m
sional
again
Forms
partic
pear
of w
confir
ackno
given
to all
given
subject
follow
rity of
ex conf
jure hu
is unla
a pow
made
Christ
take q
them, t
and to
given
will ne
him, t
and th
over Pr
Church
hope h
or that
ther C
the on
Office
as com

be the truth of God in point of Church-Government, viz. Government by Ministers acting in parity, and ruling Elders met in Congregational, Classcal, Provincial and National Presbyteries or Assemblies; it is more easily upheld against his undermining Engines, than any of the other Forms; for the least of his Book is levelled against it in particular and what he saith against it, I hope, will appear not to have great strength; yea, I believe, that out of what he hath said, this truth may be strongly confirmed; which I shall thus essay in a word. He acknowledgeth and stily maintaineth, that *Christ hath given power, not only of teaching, but of ruling his Church, to all and every one of his Ministers; and that he hath not given more power to one of them than another, nor made them subject or subordinate to one another.* Whence it clearly followeth that *Presbyterian Government* (I mean the parity of Ministers and their Association) is *jure divino, ex confesso*; and that *Prelacy* is an addition to it, made *jure humano*. And hence it followeth, that this addition is unlawful; except he can prove that Christ hath given a power to men to make them unequal, whom he hath made equal; to subject one to another of them, to whom Christ hath given equal power; to restrain, yea and take quite away the exercise of ruling power in some of them, to whom Christ hath given it as much as to others; and to enlarge that power in some, to whom Christ hath given no more than to others. Which I am sure he will never be able to do: Yea further it's confessed by him, that *Christ hath instituted the Office of Presbyters*; and that he hath not instituted the Office of Prelates, ruling over Presbyters: Wherefore he must either say, that the Church hath power to institute new Offices, which I hope he will not assert, and I am sure he cannot prove; or that Prelacy is unlawful. For, that a Prelate is another Officer than a Presbyter, is undeniable, because the one is ruled by the other. Now these of the same Office cannot be ruled by or subordinate to one another; as common sense and reason will teach.

§. 2. But to come to the Book it self. My design is not a full Refutation, but some brief Animadversions for private satisfaction, and mine own establishment in these truths, that he endeavoureth to shake: Neither do I intend to meddle with the whole, but only to cull out these passages, that relate to *Presbyterian* Government, and any that might infer the unferling of that or any part of it.

§ 3. The first thing, that I meet with, to be disproved, is p. 2. where he asserteth a Principle, that will not only shake our Faith (if it be received) in the point of Church-Government; but (which I hope he doth not intend) will unsettle us in most points of Christian Religion. His Principle is this, *That Difference in Opinion about a point, and probable Arguments brought on both hands by wise and able men; if it be not a matter of necessity to Salvation, gives men ground to think, that a final decision of the matter in Controversie was never intended as a necessary means for the Peace and Unity of the Church of God.* His Opinion in this he setteth down in fewer and clearer words in the Contents of *ch. 1. things*, saith he, *necessary for the Churches peace must be clearly revealed: the Form of Church Government is not so, as appears by the remaining Controversie about it.* I shall first shew the danger and falsehood of this Principle, and then try the strength of what he saith for the establishment of it. And 1. I argue thus: This Assertion destroyeth it self: for if no point, not necessary to Salvation, be so sure, that we must necessarily hold it, in order to peace: then this his Assertion falleth under the same condition, and needeth not to be maintain'd, for it is not needful to Salvation; I hope, they will go to Heaven, that are not of his mind in this; and I am confident he doth not think it so clear, that no wise and able men will controvert with him about it; and if it be needless in order to the Churches peace, why is it here laid down as the first stone of the Foundation, on which he buildeth his *Inimicum*? but it fareth here with our Author, as it doth

with

with all other Abettors of *Scepticism*; they attain at least so far their end, as they make men question that Opinion, that they labour to establish, by perswading them to question every thing.

§. 4. Secondly, There is no cause at all, why the Author should except from the uncertainty, here asserted, things, that are of necessity to Salvation; for, if we are to think, that the Lord hath so clearly revealed things not needful to Salvation, which are needful to peace in the Church; much rather are we to think so of things needful to Salvation (which also cannot but be necessary to peace; for we can have no peace with them, that destroy the Foundation.) For it hath hitherto been a received Principle, that things of necessity to Salvation are revealed with more clearness, than other things. And, though *Papists* have laboured to cast a Mist upon Scripture discovery in both sorts of things, that they might take all power to themselves over the Truths of God, and Consciences of men, in determining what is truth; (as Dr. *Stillingsfleet* would darken the discovery of the *circa-fundamentals* of Religion, that he might put the power of determining these things in the hand of the Magistrate) yet *Protestants* have ever firmly maintained, that however the Scripture speaketh darkly in some things, not essential; yet that the light of it is most clear in things necessary to Salvation. They are not then of this mans mind, who will have the things, that do not so nearly relate to Salvation, but are needful to peace, so clearly revealed, that there can remain no Controversie about them among wise and able men, but excepteth from this necessity, things of necessity to Salvation. From what hath been said, I argue thus against Dr. *Stillingsfleet's* Principle: If any things not necessary to Salvation be so necessary to be clearly revealed, that we are to look upon them as not Christ's Truth, if there remain a Controversie about them, managed with specious Arguments on both sides among wise and able men, much more things necessary to Salvation must be thus

clearly revealed; so that there is no truth in them, if they be so controverted; but the consequent is most false and absurd, and overturneth all the Foundations of our Religion: for have not the *Arrian, Soecinian, Arminian, and Popish* Controversies been managed, yea and are they not managed by the Adversaries of Truth with Learning even to admiration. We must then, according to this principle, not take either part of these debates for truth, but think that the Lord hath determined nothing in them, and we must leave it to men to determine in them what they please, and must embrace that. Is not this a fine device to cast loose all to bring in Scepticism instead of Faith, to make way for a subtle Sophister to nullifie any truth, by disputing speciously against it? Yet this we are to bless the Lord for, that the overturners of the Government of Christ's house, have no other means to cast it loose by, but these, that do also cast loose all our Religion: which hope will be a consideration to fix this truth the better in the minds of them, who are serious and intelligent.

§. 3. Thirdly, If these things not necessary to salvation, that speciously on both hands are controverted, be not needful to be determined in our consciences, in order to the Churches peace, I ask the Author of this Assertion, What things of that nature are needful to the Churches peace, that we hold an opinion about them? Or are there any things such? or must we hesitate about all the *circa-fundamentals* in Religion, and look on them as indifferences determinable by men, we will not be guilty of disturbing the peace of the Church? I hope this good man will not say so: and yet it would necessarily follow out of this principle maintained by him; for I believe he cannot instance in many things (scarce in any) that are not of necessity to salvation, which are not controverted; and that with specious pretence. For learned men, when they erre, use not to come off so bluntly, as barely to say, *it is so*, or *I think so*; but they bring plausible Reasons, and those often pre-

tende

tended to be drawn from Scripture, for their foulest errors. If then we receive this principle, we must not think it needful to the Churches peace, to determine whether there be two Sacraments or seven; whether there be Purgatory; whether we are to pray to Saints departed; whether there be power of Censure in Church-men; or if all Church-power be in the Magistrate; whether the Pope be the head of the Church; &c. for all these, and such-like, are controverted; and there are colourable Arguments for the Errours, that men maintain in these points. If this, our Author will not assert, what reason is there, that he should maintain, that the Form of Church-Government is not determined by men for the Churches peace; and that because there are Controversies about what is the Form appointed by Christ.

§. 6. But I come now to examine what the Author hath to say for this Assertion of his. *We cannot, saith he, with any shew of reason imagine, that Christ, who hath made it a necessary duty for a'l the Members of the Church to endeavour the Peace and Unity of it, should suspend the performance of that duty upon a matter of Opinion, which when many have used their utmost endeavour to satisfy themselves about, they yet find, that those very grounds, which they are most inclinable to build their Judgments upon, are either wholly rejected by others as wise and able as themselves, or else, it may be, they erect a far different Fabrick upon the very same Foundations.* Ans. 1. The weakness, if not wickedness of this Argument will easily appear, by making an Assumption to the Proposition here set down, and considering what will necessarily follow, which I shall thus perform. *That Christ is true God, is a matter of Opinion, which, when we have used our utmost endeavours to satisfy our selves about it, we yet find that those very grounds, which we are most inclinable to build our Judgments upon, are either wholly rejected by others, as wise and able as we, or else that they erect on them a far different Fabrick;*

for it's well known that the *Socinians*, who are men of Wisdom and Ability, though it be unsanctified; and especially *Grotius* (the wonder of his Age for Learning) though yet he profess the truth in this point: That I say, they do wholly reject all the grounds, on which we do build our Faith in this point; and that on many of them they endeavour to erect a contrary Fabrick. It doth then follow *vi syllogisticâ* (supposing our Author's Proposition) that we cannot with any shew of reason think that Christ would have us suspend the performance of our duty in endeavouring the peace of the Church on this, *That Christ is true God*; and so we must by this Argument yield this Truth as a *matter determinable by men, rather than hold an Opinion in it with the loss of peace in the Church*. I hope the Author will not own this Conclusion; wherefore he ought not to own that his Assertion, out of which it is clearly deducible.

§. 7. *Ans. 2.* There is very great reason for that, for which he denyeth all shew of reason; for some matters of Opinion of that condition, which he describeth, are the Truths of God, as is clear from what hath been said; but we are to suspend the endeavouring of the Churches peace, rather than part with any Truth of God, or then we should yield it up to men's determinations, as if it were none of his truths.

Ans. 3. When we are to judge of the validity of the grounds, on which we build our opinion about truth, it is not the thoughts of men as wise and able as we, that must determine us; for, we know, the wisest may mistake, when they, who are less wise, may hit the truth through the grace of God: but we must consider whether these grounds be the dictates of the Spirit of God in his word: and if they be, we must not be shaken in mind by the contrary assertions of men, though never so wise, yea and holy too. I grant the opinions of such should make us search carefully; but they must not hinder our assent to the truth of God. And this is a valid reason, why we are to suspend our endeavours of peace

on some matters of opinion, though contradicted by wise and able men.

§. 8. He addeth, *That it is not consistant with Christs Wisdom to leave the peace of his Church at the mercy of men's private opinions; which are most uncertain; for it is not expected, that all men should be of the same mind.* *Ans.* 1. It is too great rashness to think that Christ cannot be a wise Governour of his Church, unless he take courses for its settlement, that our Wisdom thinketh meet. I hope Christ may wisely govern his Church and yet not leave it to Men to determine, what shall be the form of it's Government, which yet cannot be, if this reason prove that, which it is brought for. 2. We may easily grant the conclusion of this argument, without giving the least advantage to the assertion, which it is brought to prove. It is true, Christ hath not left the peace of his Church at the mercy of men's private opinions; *viz.* So as that there can be no peace in the Church, except all men agree in opinion about all things: for peace may be maintained among dissenting Brethren, by harmony of affection, mutual forbearance, and a prudent managing and concealing of our opinion, so far, as it may be without sin: and all this may be done without denying that, which we differ about, to be determined by Christ; and asserting it to be a thing left indifferent. And if this be not particable, either through the Nature of the truth, that we dissent about; in that it is practical, or so important that it cannot be concealed; or through the obstinacy, or wrong zeal of dissenters; the Lord hath not left his Church without a Remedy even in this case, *viz.* they who do unreasonably dissent must be censured, or shunned: and if this cannot be done without breach of peace, it is our Lords Wisdom to provide, that we should rather loose Peace then Truth. 3. All that is here said will as well prove, that there is no fixed truth in any controverted point, though of never so great concernment: for it may be said also in these, that Christ hath not left the peace of his Church

Church at the mercy of Men's private opinions, which are not the same in the most fundamental points. But of this enough.

§. 9. From what hath been said, we may see what fit advice this healer giveth, while he thus saith, p. 3. *The only way left for the Church's settlement and peace, under such variety of apprehensions, concerning the means and method in order to it, is to pitch upon such a foundation, if possible to be found out, whereon the different parties, retaining their private apprehensions, may yet be agreed to carry on the same work in Common, in order to the peace and tranquillity of the Church of God.* Hitherto we consent with him, and wish he would help us to such a Foundation, so as it self be founded on the Word of God and not contrary to it. But he goeth on. *Which, saith he, cannot be by leaving all absolutely to follow their own ways; for that were to build a Babel instead of Salem.* This also we grant: but that which follows we cannot agree to. *It must be then, saith he, by convincing men, that neither of these ways to Peace and Order, which they contend about is necessary by way of Divine command (though some be as a means to an end) but which particular way or form it must be, is wholly left to the prudence of those, in whose Power and Trust it is to see the Peace of the Church secured on lasting Foundations.* If this be a fit way of healing Church-rents, then those Churches are in the best way to peace, who cast away the Bible, and will not look there what God hath commanded: because some may say, he hath commanded this, and others, he hath commanded that: and so refer all controversies to be determined by men, as supposing nothing to be determined by God. And indeed this is the basis that the peace of the Popish Church standeth upon: and I believe no Jesuit would have given another advice, than this, toward the settling of our divided condition. What? Must we say that neither way is commanded of God, whether it be so or not? when we can prove from Scripture that this is Christ's Institution, that not, but a device and usurpation of men;

men; must we yield this our ground? and leave the whole matter to men's wills, as being the readiest way to peace. If this be his cure for Church-Divisions, I believe they, who take the word of God for their rule, especially in Church-matters, will think it worse than the Disease. Every way to peace is not a good way, otherwise there were no duty at any time to contend for the truth, once delivered to the Saints, Jude 3.

§. 10. I do not dissent from the learned Author in his Determinations about the Nature of *Right* and *Divine Right*, but must examine some of the Principles, from which he will have a *Divine Right* to be inferred. Wherefore as to the rest of the first Chapter, I first take notice, that what he largely discourseth from p. 6. to p. 11. concerning the lawfulness of that, which is not forbidden by God; however it may be granted *sano sensu* (on which I now insist not;) yet it doth not reach his point, unless he prove that Christ hath determined *no species of Government*; for if he hath determined one, then all other inconsistent with it are *eo ipso* prohibited: Wherefore, though we grant to him, that *ratio regiminis ecclesiastici* is *juris naturalis*; yet we cannot grant, except he proves it, that the *modus* of it is *juris divini permissivi*; that is to say, it is *juris humani*; but we assert it to be *juris divini, partim naturalis, partim positivi, viz.* in respect of the divers parts, of which that Form is made up, which are approved of God.

§. 11. To make up an Obligation, whereby we are bound to a thing as duty, we assert with him, that there is required *Legislation and Promulgation* of it. But what he saith of the way of Promulgation of Divine Positive Laws, that is necessary to lay an Obligation on us, I cannot fully agree to. P. 12. He asserteth that whatsoever binds Christians as an universal standing Law, must be clearly revealed as such, and laid down in Scripture in such evident terms, as all who have their senses exercised therein, may discern it to have been the will of Christ, that it should perpetually oblige all Believers to the Worlds end;

as

as is clear in the case of Baptism and the Lords Supper
 But because the learned Author could not but see, how
 obvious it was to every one to argue against this Assertion
 from the instances of the change of the Sabbath
 and Infant Baptism, which he acknowledgeth to be
Christ's Will and Law established, and yet not thus re-
vealed; therefore he laboureth to obviate that Argument
 by this exception; (to wit) that *there is not the*
same necessity for a particular and clear revelation in the alteration
of a Law unrepealed in some circumstances of it, as
there is for the establishing of a new Law: The former
 (saith he) may be done by a different practice of persons
 infallibly guided; as in the case of the change of the Sabbath
 and Infant Baptism; not so the latter. To this I
 reply a few things. 1. It had been good, if, in an
 Assertion so fundamental to his whole discourse, and
 so positive for the clearness of Divine Laws, he himself
 had used more clearness; there is no small muddiness
 and ambiguity in his expressions, which I must a
 little remove. And first, when he saith, that *Christ's*
Laws must be revealed clearly as such; either he meaneth
 (as Hooker, Eccles. polit. defending this Opinion of our
 Author's, expresseth it) that they must be set down in
 the Form of Laws. But it is too great presumption to
 prescribe to him, how he should word the intimations
 of his will to his People; or in what mode or form he
 should speak to them: His will manifested to us is that
 which obligeth us; and this may be without such a Form.
 Or he meaneth, that Christ's Laws must be so clearly re-
 vealed, as that *we may come to know, that this we are to do,*
and that to forbear, and that he would have us to take notice
of it as his Will; and this we agree to, and do
 maintain, that the Form of Church-Government is
 thus revealed. Another ambiguity is, that he requir-
 eth them to be laid down in *such evident terms as all who*
have their senses exercised therein, may discern them to be
his will to oblige us. If he meant that they, who have
 competent understanding and means, and do seriously search
 the

the truth in these things (which, I suppose, is the meaning of having their senses exercised in them) may for the objective evidence of the things come to know them; this we do not deny; if he mean, that *such will certainly be convinced of them, and that there can be no impediment insuperable by them, neither in the Object, nor in their blindness or prejudice, or other Infirmary or Disadvantage that they lye under, which may make them, that they cannot see that to be the will of Christ, which is so revealed;* this we utterly deny. Now this latter, not the former, must be his meaning, because it is nothing to the purpose, which I will not impute to so learned a man; for what is not so revealed, is not revealed at all, seeing it is unintelligible by defect of objective light; now, to say that Christ's Laws must be thus revealed, is to say that they must be promulgated, some way or other; which was never questioned by any; and maketh nothing for his design, viz. that *Christ's Laws must be so revealed, as that the disputes about them shall be taken away.* Yea, he cannot mean this, for the change of any Circumstance of an old Law must at least be thus revealed, else it is not revealed at all; and yet he requireth another sort of Revelation of new Laws, as appeareth from what hath been said.

§. 12. 2. If this Assertion thus explained were true, there should remain no more Controversie among serious and learned men about any of the Laws of Christ; for such have their senses exercised in these things: Wherefore they may (if we believe this Author) know such to be Christ's Laws, and therefore cannot be in an Error about them. But how absurd this is, sad Experience maketh too evident: Is it not a Controversie whether Christ hath appointed seven or but two Sacraments? whether he hath commanded us to pray to Saints departed? whether Excommunication be by his Law, &c. We must then either say, that Christ hath made no Law in these things; or that men cannot mistake in them; but that they who oppose the truth here-
in,

in, do oppose that which they know to be Christ's Law, or that Christ hath made and revealed a Law about these things, but these men cannot see it, which is contrary to the Author's Assertion.

3. Is it not enough to bind the Conscience of any, who soberly seek to know what is the good, and perfect, and acceptable will of God, that the Lord in his word hath given some intimation, from which we may gather, that such a thing is his will: Sure, seeing it is his will, that bindeth the Conscience, whatever way we come to the knowledge of this will, we are obliged by it to our duty. Now we may be able, in some cases, to deduce from Scripture such a thing to be the will of God, though it be not set down in such evident terms as are here mentioned, as is clear to any who do consider.

4. There are many points of Truth, or many *Credenda*, in the Scripture, which want such an Evidence of Revelation, as is here required; which yet we are to believe as the truths of God; for it is clear, that the Lord hath taught us many things in the Bible, as it were on the bye, and left them to be gathered from Scripture Assertions: yea many times Truths are couched in Duties commanded, as Commands also are comprehended in Assertions and Promises. Now if this clearness of terms in the Revelation of the *Credenda* of Religion be not necessary to bind the Conscience to believe, how is it imaginable, that it should be necessary in the Revelation of the *Agenda*, to bind the Will to act? seeing the Lord doth as peremptorily require us to believe what he hath said, as to do what he hath commanded.

5. For the exception that he maketh of the *changing some Circumstances of old Laws*; I see not on what Foundation of reason, the difference between these and new Laws can stand; but that this shift serveth his purpose: For (to take his own instance) supposing a standing Law for a Sabbath, and that the *seventh day must be kept*: This Circumstance (as he is pleas'd to call it) that not the *seventh*, but the *first day* be

be kept, is really a new law: yea there are here two new laws; one abrogating what was before, and making it no duty to keep the *seventh day*: another establishing a new, which was not before, and making it a duty to keep the *first day*. Now if this may be thought no obliging law of Christ without that evidence of revelation, which he talks of, why may not another thing, that was not such before? If we are to look to *Apostolick practice* as ground sufficient why we should think it Christs will, that we should keep the *first day of the week to the Lord*; which was not done before; why should we not think the same ground sufficient, why Ministers should rule the Church by a parity of Authority? Yea, reason would say, that there is need of more clearness, in the revelation of Christ's will for altering a standing law in such of it's circumstances as doth annul one duty, and establish another, than for settling that as duty which is altogether new, seeing in the former, we must both know the will of God in abrogating and establishing: in the later we are to know only, that he will stablish such a thing.

§. 13. In his examination of what maketh an unalterable Divine right, I agree to most that he teacheth; only his *Postulatum* p. 14. one which he buildeth all his assertions, needeth to be a little cleared. He asserteth that *nothing can be founded on Divine Right, nor bind Believers as a positive Law, but what may be certainly known to have come from God, with an intention to bind Believers to the Worlds end*. Where I only take notice that, though *Plerophory* in that case be very desirable; yet such certainty is not necessary to our obligation: But so much knowledge of the will of God as may satisfy the Conscience, by inclining it to the one hand, and not leaving it absolutely in suspense. If this be not sufficient, we shall take off all obligation of Gods positive laws from most men: for few have plerophorie in most things. I agree with him, that *a divine right is built on the law of nature, and on the immutable positive laws*
of

of God: also, that these are three good marks of the immutability of divine positive laws, which he bringeth: viz. when the reason of the law remains: when God hath declared such a law never to be changed: when it conduces to the being of a Society, that he would have to continue. Only I cannot see how these (especially the former two marks) do consist with the mutability of the Church government, (in these things we controvert about) which the Apostles practised (no doubt, as being Christs will and law) seeing there is the same reason for parity now, that then was: and Christ hath not said, that he will have it altered in after ages.

S. 14. Page 23. He comes to examine some pretences (as he is pleased to call them) for a divine right. And first, he laboureth to enervate the argument for the divine right of Church-Government, taken from Apostolical practice: of which he promiseth to say more after: but what he here saith, we shall examine. I yield to him, that all Scripture examples do not bind; neither doth any example bind as an example: also, that the rule, whereby we know what examples do bind, is not immediately obligatory, but directive. I grant likewise that in such examples, that which bindeth us, is either the moral nature of the action, or the law commanding us to follow the example. And yet all these concessions yield him no advantage, neither bring our cause any loss: for when he requireth us, who plead for the divine right of a particular form of Church-Government from Apostolical example, to shew either the morality of their actions; or a law commanding us to follow them: I Answer, as to the first, there needeth no particular demonstration of the morality of Apostolick actions: but this we can say for them, the nature and condition of the actions, and the Apostles doing of them, being considered; reason will not suffer us to question the morality of them. I mean it is certain that they are the will of Christ: for we must think that in matters not light and occasional, but weighty and

and of great concernment whether they be well or ill done; and which were done on mature deliberation; as the administration of the affairs of Christ's house: in matters, I say, of this nature, we are to think that the Apostles did that which was best and most approved of God; they being infallibly guided by his spirit. Now that, which was best to them, must certainly be best to us also, we managing the same affairs; except some diversity of our case from theirs can be shewn: wherefore we are obliged to think that the parity of Ministers in ruling the Church, is Christ's will, and so a moral duty; (not a thing indifferent) seeing it was so in the Apostolick Churches; as, I suppose, is proved by the maintainers of that way: and there is no reason why it should be otherwise with us than with them. For the second, we have also a law for following Apostolical example (as we have for following Christ's example; which, our Author saith, maketh it our duty); viz. 1 Cor. 4. 16. *Wherefore I beseech you be ye followers of me.* 1 Cor. 11. 1. *Be ye followers of me, even as I am of Christ.* And lest any think that this command of imitation is only in reference to duties otherways known to be such, as faith, love, &c. it is evident that this last place relateth to Church administrations; for he prefixeth this exhortation to the doctrine of decency and purity in their worship. Beside, that the exhortation being general, can suffer no exception; but where imitation would not have the same morality in us, that giving example had in them, viz. where the case is different. Other Scriptures to the same purpose are *Phil. 3. 17. Heb. 6. 12.* and this is commended (which clearly supposeth a command) 1 *Thes. 1. 6.* and 2. 14. 2 *Thes. 3. 9. Ja. 5. 10.* Wherefore, if we can shew Apostolical practice for our way of Church-Government (as I know we can) it is incumbent on our adversaries to shew a reason why they did such things; which doth not agree to our case; or

C

else

else to submit to that way, as that which is Christ's law. For the other grounds of divine right, that he examineth, we insist not on them, as not being necessary to the defence of that truth which we maintain. Wherefore I wave what might be said against what he there disputeth.

CHAP. II.

§. 1. **I**N the second chapter of the first part of his *Institutum* he layeth some hypotheses for a foundation of his following discourse: where I shall pass over in silence, these things that have truth in them; and these also, the examining of which is not needful to the present purpose, viz. defending Presbyterial Government to be *juris divini*. Only, I take notice, that here, and through his whole book, he spendeth more of his pains and learning, in proving these points which are either digressions from the present business or are not denied by any of his opposites: which *magno conatu nihil agere*.

§. 2. In his fourth hypothesis, p. 38. some thing need our remark: he setteth it down thus: *In things which are determined both by the law of nature and divine positive laws, as to the substance and morality of them, are not determined as to all circumstances belonging to them, is in the power of lawful authority in the Church of God to determine them so far as they judge them tend to the promoting of the performance of them in due manner.* Two things in this hypothesis I condemn. 1. That he warranteth men to determine things undetermined in the Church, so far as they judge needful: he should have said, so far as needful: for if we hold this his assertion *in terminis*, perfitious men in lawful authority may bind us in things where Christ hath left us free; so that it shall not be lawful to speak, look or act in the Church

that as they think fit. And indeed here is a foundation for almost all the Ceremonies that either Popes or Prelates ever burthened the Church of God with: they are nothing but determinations of what is left undetermined; and they judge them to tend to promote worship: as, it is not determined, what Garment a Minister shall wear, the Church judgeth a Surplice to tend to promote worship: then by this hypothesis, the Church may determine this: which is not only against truth, as might easily be shewed, if that were now my work, but also against this Author, who declareth himself against Ceremonies of Mens appointing.

2. That he extendeth this determining power so far, that not only things undetermined, and that must be determined, otherwise the Ordinances cannot be gone about without defect or sin, may be determined by lawful authority (for this we grant, and therefore do close with his example of appointing the place and hour for worship) but also things that *they judge tend to promote the due manner of the Ordinances*, may be thus determined; which a little after he expoundeth of the *decency and solemnity of worship*. This we cannot assent to: For there is no pompous Ceremony that ever man devised, but they judged it fit to promote the solemnity of worship. And indeed the Scripture condemning the pompousness and gaudiness of worship, and commending the simplicity of it, saith plainly, that it is not left to men to add their determinations to God's, to make the worship as solemn as they judge meet; but that we ought to be content with that solemnity, which is made in worship by God's Institutions, and the needful determination of circumstances. Neither can this blow to his hypothesis be evited, by saying, that he speaketh only of circumstances, which we confess may be determined by the Church. For 1. All Ceremonies are also circumstances; and he doth not here mention meer circumstances, to exclude Ceremonies from the determining power of

Authority in the Church. 2. Though he should be understood of meer circumstances, *viz.* which are such before they be determined, as the habit in which we are to worship: yet even such, when they are determined by men without necessity, only, that they may add to the worship a decency, which is not needful by nature, civil custom, nor divine institution, they become Religious Ceremonies; their end being Religious, and they being peculiar to Religion: As I have shewn in another piece.

§. 3. It seemeth to me very strange, and not to be passed over in our Animadversions; that in the prosecuting of this his hypothesis, wherein he had ascribed a determining power to lawful Authority in the Church, he taketh notice of no power or Authority seated in Church-men; but speaketh only of the Magistrate: for p. 38. shewing why there is need to prove this hypothesis, he tells us of *some that give no power, and some that give little power to the Magistrate about Religion*: and then falleth upon a large debate of the Magistrate's power in Church-matters. Which is an evident supposing, that all Church-power is in the Magistrate, and in none else: otherwile this discourse should be very impertinent to his hypothesis. But this supposition is a gross falshood, as is fully proved by many worthy men against *Erastus* and his followers. I shall not now ingage in that large debate. If we should grant a determining power to any authority about the things in hand, it should not be to the *Civil Magistrate*; but to the Guides of the Church met in a lawful Assembly. And it is not only contrary to truth, but a contradiction to what this Author writeth elsewhere, in his Appendix about *Excommunication*; where he taketh much pains to assert a power of Discipline in the *Church-Guides*: and if so, certainly the Magistrate is not the lawful Authority in the Church: for that implyeth Church Authority. I hope he will not say, that Ministers have lawful Authority in the

the State; because they have no Civil Authority: why then should we say, or suppose, that the Magistrate hath lawful Authority in the Church; except he think that the Magistrate hath *Church-Authority*? against which he there disputeth; especially seeing *Respublica non est Ecclesia, sed Ecclesia in Republica*; he that hath only Civil power, hath no power in the Church, whatever he hath about Church matters, and over Church-men.

§. 4. In asserting the Magistrates power in these things, he professeth, that he will not so much make his way through any party, as strive to beget a right understanding among them that differ: how well he keepeth his promise may be seen, by examining what he saith; on which I will not much insist, (intending to meet with this his Doctrine elsewhere) but only mark what is amiss, with a short ground of our censure of it: for this debate is somewhat extrinsecal to the *indifferency of Church-Government*: it rather supposeth it, than asserteth or proveth it. In explicating his second distinction about the Magistrate's power, p. 41. *The internal, formal, elicitive power of order, saith he, lies in the Authoritative exercise of the Ministerial function, in Preaching of the word, and Administration of the Sacraments; but the external, objective, imperative power of jurisdiction lies in a due care and provision for the defence, protection, and propagation of Religion.* The former is only proper to the *Ministry*, the later to the *Supream Magistracy*. Here several things are to be noted. 1. That he maketh the power of Order to be all one with internal, formal, elicitive power about Church affairs; and the power of Jurisdiction the same with external, objective and imperative power about them. This is instead of distinguishing to confound things most different: for, I hope, he is not Ignorant that all the Assertors of Church-power against the *Erastians*, do distinguish Church-power, or the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven (for so is this power designed by Christ) in the power or Key of Order; and the

power or Key of Jurisdiction. Let the Author shew us one (not *Erastian*) who before himself did ever make the power of Order in the Church to comprehend all formal and elicitive Church-power. Yea, he doth by this most evidently contradict himself (which I wonder to meet with so often in such a learned man) for in his Appendix he maketh the power of Discipline to be *in the Church*; and so to be *formal, internal and elicitive Church-power*: and sure the power of Discipline is the power of *Jurisdiction*, not of *Order*: not only because all that speak of this distinction do understand it: but also our Author doth here make the *power of Order* to respect only the word and Sacraments; and so the *power of Discipline* must belong to Jurisdiction, according to him: now whereas he maketh the power of Jurisdiction there to be internal only in the Church: and here to be external in the Magistrate only; if this be not a contradiction, let any man judge. 2. Another thing, that here I take notice of, is, that the power which he ascribeth to the Ministry is only *Administration of the Word and Sacraments*. Then they have no power of *Discipline*, every one knoweth that that is some other thing than the Word and Sacraments. Now this is contradictory to the whole of his own Appendix: and also to Scripture, which giveth to Church-Officers power *binding and loosing*, *Mat. 18. 18. Jo. 20. 23.* and *of binding the Lord's People*, *1 Thes. 5. 12, Heb. 13. 17.* I insist not on this, it having been made evident so many against the *Erastians*. 3. He ascribed power about Church affairs to the Magistrate, except that of Administring the Word and Sacraments, and so to the Magistrate as it is only belonging to him: for he giveth him that which he called the power of Jurisdiction, and that is to him all power but that of Word and Sacraments. Now there was never an *Erastian* that gave more to the Magistrate than this: for by this means, he hath all the power of deciding

controversies in Synods (for that is not preaching of the Word) of Ordination, the exercise of Discipline, &c. and none but he hath any share in it. Behold unto what absurdities this man runneth unawares, while he maketh it his business to unhinge that Government which Christ hath settled in his Church. And indeed I cannot but take notice of a necessary connexion between this putting all Church-power in the hands of the Magistrate, and denying it to be *jure divini*. For he knew well, that if it had been left to be decided by Church-men among themselves; it had not been easily determined amidst the interest of men clashing one with another; the more conscientious and self-denied sort being ever the fewest.

§. 5. Page 42. Speaking of the Subordination or Co-ordination of the Magistracy and Ministry, there be some mistakes worthy of our notice. Though he acknowledgeth the *person of the Magistrate to be subject to the word of God*, yet he denieth it to be *subject to the power of the Ministers*. This is the Doctrine of Court-preachers, who love to flatter rather than speak truth. But consider. 1 It is to me an inconsistency, that Ministers have power or authority of Preaching the Word; and the Magistrate's person is subject to this Word, and yet he is not subject to the power of Ministers. When they teach, rebuke, exhort with all authority and command in the name of the Lord; doth not this reach Magistrates as well as others, if they be subject to the word of God? I see not how they are subject to it, if they be not subject to it as declared by Christ's Embassadors, which is the ordinary way of dispensing it: and if so, then are they subject to the Preaching power of Ministers at least. 2. Magistrates are also subject to the ruling power of Ministers: for they rule over Christ's Flock; the Members of the Church, of which number, if the Magistrate be, I see no ground in Scri-

pture for exempting him from the power of their Jurisdiction. When Christ said, *Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained*; he did not add, except the supream Magistrates. May not, I pray, the Pastors of the Church debar him, if he be a flagitious man, from the Lord's Table, as *Ambrose* did to *Theodosius*? and if they may, certainly the Magistrate personally considered is subject to the ruling power of Pastors in spiritual things; as they are subject to him in civil things. And to deny this, what is it, but to make the supream Magistrate head of the Church and not a Member of it? Much more worthy to be received is the opinion of *Crysostome*, who speaketh thus to Ecclesiastical persons, in reference to abstention from the Lord's Supper; *Si dux igitur quispiam, si Consul ipse, si, qui diademate ornatur, indigne adeat, cohibe ac coerce; majorem tu illo habes auctoritatem.*

6. He cometh afterward, p. 43. to ascribe to the Magistrate not only a political power, which he maketh to lie in the Execution and Administration of laws for the common good: but also an *Architectonical and Nomothetical* power (though not absolute and independent) whereby he may make laws in things that belong to the Church. His meaning in this he expresseth more fully in the end of p. 44. *In matters,* saith he, *undetermined by the word of God concerning the external policy of the Church of God, the Magistrate hath the power of determining things, so they be agreeable to the word of God.* And because he knew that the Church-Guides would put in for this Power, that here he giveth to the Magistrate, therefore, p. 45. he laboureth to reconcile these parties, by a distinction or two, viz. between *declaring Christ's Laws, and making new Laws*: and between *advising what is fit, and determining what shall be done.* The declaring and advising Power is given by him to the Church; the Authoritative determining power to the Magistrate. For p. 46. *The*

great

great use, saith he, of Synods and Assemblies of Pastors of the Church is, to be as the Council of the Church unto the King; as the Parliament is for matters of Civil Government. And p. 47. but yet, saith he, When such men thus assembled have gravely and naturally advised and deliberated what is fittest to be done; the force, strength, and obligation of the thing so determined doth depend on the Power and Authority of the Civil Magistrate. Against this Doctrine (before I come to examine the Reasons that he bringeth for it) I have these things to say. 1. It must be noted (by passing over which in silence our Author hath confounded the matter) that we are not here speaking of things that are properly Civil, though belonging to the Church, viz. as it is a Society, and in the Commonwealth; such as Church-rents, Meeting-places, liberty of the use of them, &c. but of the Government of the Church, as it is a Church, of its Discipline; which things are properly the external policy of that Church, as our Author termeth that which he speaketh of. Now the Question is, whether the Power of determining these, be in the Church-Guides or the Magistrate. 2. That which is the *ἡγεμονία τοῦ λαοῦ*, and the ground of most of this Author's mistakes, is, he supposeth that some things of this Church-policy are so left undetermined by the word, that they are capable of a determination by men's Legislative power, and that new Laws may be made about them. This is not truth; for, if we speak of the Substantials of Church-Government, even of a particular Form, it is determined in the word, and so not subject to men's Nomothetical Determinations; if of the Circumstances of it, neither are these left for men to make Laws about them, but they are determined by the Lord, in the general Rules that are in the word, and the Dictates of right reason compared with them; and the Obligation, that lyeth on our Consciences in these things, is not from the Magistrates Law (though we do not deny but he may add his Sanction to both sorts of things, and make

make them the Law of the Nation, as Dr. *Stillings* saith well, that he may with any thing in Religion) but from the will of God, which ought to be searched out and held forth Authoritatively by the Guides of the Church, that are acting in the name of Christ. 3. It is false then that the *Magistrate hath Power in determining what of the External Policy of the Church is undetermined in the word.* For if we speak of that which is not determined at all, neither by particular Præcepts or Examples, or otherwise, signifying particularly the mind of Christ about such a thing, viz. by the general rules of the word compared with right reason, is not held forth to be the mind of Christ; such things ought not to be determined by any man or men, but are left to Christ's Liberty; for such things must be determined merely by man's will, but the Lord hath not left the matters of his Church to that crooked rule. But if we speak of things not determined by particular præcepts, &c. yet in which the mind of Christ is deducible by general rules: Neither here hath the Magistrate the determining Power, but they, whom the Lord hath made the Guides and Eyes of his Church; they must declare what is the will of Christ, not impose what is their own Will or Law. And here the Obligation is from the will of Christ, not the Authority of the Church, nor the Magistrate neither; the declaration of it from them, whom Christ hath made his Embassadors. For what I have said, I give this brief reason, The Affairs of the Church are to be managed by a Ministerial Power, the farthest extent of which is to declare Christ's Laws, and apply them; as is generally confessed by *Protestants* against *Papists*: but the Magistrate's Power is not Ministerial, but Magisterial: *Ergo*, it is not his part to manage or determine the Affairs of the Church, of which doubtless her external Policy is no small part, which may be further enforced thus; Church-Determinations must be the Declarations of the will of Christ, but not the Magistrate, but the Pastors are the Embassadors of Christ, whose it is to declare his will: *ergo*, it is not his

but their part to make such Determinations. We
 speak not of the Judgment of Discretion, which the
 Magistrate hath in these things, in order to the adding
 his Sanction to them; and that not only as others have,
 theirs being private, and his publick and with Autho-
 rity: But we speak of that determination of things,
 which is the ordinary means of promulgating to us the
 mind of Christ in Church-matters. 4. It is most false
 that the *great use of Synods is to be the King's Church-Coun-
 cil, as the Parliament is his Civil Council*; for, 1. himself
 acknowledgeth another use of them, while he ascribeth
 to the Church, a power of declaring Christ's Laws; is
 not this of great use? but Contradictions are no rarity
 in this Author. 2. Hence it followeth, that as Parli-
 amentary Acts have no force without the King's San-
 ction, so likewise Church-Determinations have none
 without it; and if the Church Excommunicate any
 person, it is not valid, nor his sins bound in Heaven,
 till the King put his Seal to it; for that such a person be
 Excommunicated, is not determined in Scripture.
 3. The Council at *Jerusalem, Act. 15.* and all the Councils
 before *Constantine's* time, were of no great use; for
 they had not this use, there being no Magistrate to own
 them as his Council. 4. This destroys that received
 Axiom among all them, who are not the avowed Follow-
 ers of *Erastus*, viz. that the Magistrate's power is cumu-
 lative to the Church, not privative; for it maketh his
 to swallow it up, there being no Authority, nor great
 use of Synods, without the Magistrate. 5. This taketh
 away from the Church entireness of power in her self,
 in things that do concern her as such a Society, and a
 Capacity to subsist without the Magistrate; which I
 hope this Author, when better advised, will not own.
 5. It is also false, that when Church-Guides Assem-
 bled, have deliberated and determined, the force,
 strength, and obligation of the things so determined,
 doth depend on the Magistrate; for it dependeth on the
 reason of them containing the Will of Christ, and not
 on the Authority of men.

§. 7. I come now to see what Arguments he brings for what he hath asserted. 1. Saith he, *Taking the Church as incorporated into the Civil State, though the Object of these things, the matter of them, and persons determining them be ecclesiastical, yet the force and ground of the Obligation of them is wholly Civil.* Ans. That the Church is in the Republick we do not deny: yet that must not be so understood as if either these two were not distinct Corporations, or the Power of the one were subordinate to, or swallowed up the other. The saying of Optatus Milev: (which he citeth) that *Ecclesia est in Republica non Respublica in Ecclesia*; will not bear that: but the meaning is, that either the Church is in the Rep. as the lesser society in the greater, as a few Parishes are in a County; so the Primitive Churches were in Rome, Corinth, &c. or when the Church is as late patens with the Nation, that the Church is in Protection of the Civil State, not e contra; seeing Kings must be Nursing Fathers to her, and as it were keep house for her to be nursed in. Or speaking of a National Church, that it's being a nation is Prior in order of Nature than it's being a Church; because it might be a Nation, and not a Church; but it cannot be a Church and not a Nation. Now, none of these do infer that the Obligation of determinations made by Church men, about Church affairs is civil; but it may be and is Ecclesiastical, viz. from the will of Christ, which the Church holdeth forth as his Embassadors. Wherefore this Ratiocination is altogether inconsequent. But he cometh to Authority, to see if that will help him. He citeth P. Martyr. lo.com.clas: fig. 4. c. 5. s. 11. and in 1 Sam. 8. *Nam quod ad potestatem ecclesiasticam attinet, satis est civilis Magistratus: is enim curare debet ut omnes officium faciant.* What he meaneth for citing both these places for these words, I know not, unless it be that they are to be found in them both. But I am sure neither they, nor any thing like them is in the former place (for the later I have not that part of his works) but the contrary of what this Author intendeth, is there clearly

clearly and fully taught, viz. he is refuting them who would have the Power of discipline in the Church to cease, now when the Magistrate is Christian, and he asserteth Ecclesiastical Power and Civil as distinct: and only says that the Magistrate should correct ministers if they do not carry as they ought: but this is far from that, *quod ad potestatem Ecclesie attinet, satis est civilis Magistratus*. He refers, for the judgment of the reformed Divines in this to *Vedel. de Episc. Const. Mag. et Offic. Magistratus*, annotated to *Grot. de Imper. sum. pot. circa sacra*. But it is well known that *Vedelius* was an *Erastian* and (as this Author saith) did sowlly abuse the reformed Divines making them speak what they never thought; wherefore I refer to *Apol. Triglandius, Revius*; who have refuted that seditious Pamphlet of *Vedelius*. For the other Author, let his Citations be weighed, they will never prove that any of the Reformers gave the Power of determining Church-Affairs to the Magistrate. He addeth three reasons of his Allegation, yet they are but two, for the two former do coincide, and the strength of them is; that it is from the Authority of the Magistrate, that obligation to obedience or penalty is; or (which is the same) it is from him that the sanction, or annexing of these penalties to the constitutions, is; that it is from him only that the force of obligation is in matters determined by the advice of the Church and which do concern the Church. All this is easily taken away by a well known distinction in things that are commanded by Christ, and by his Church declared to be such; and also, are ratified by the sanction of the Magistrate, there is a twofold Obligation: one *Spiritual*; this is from Christ as Law-giver; and is laid on by the Instrumental intervention of the Church as his Herald Proclaiming his will: the other *civil*, whereby we are bound to external Punishment if we contravene such a constitution; this is from the Magistrate: of this, not of the former the Author's Assertion is to be understood; otherwise it is false: For that Obligation is no way from the Magistrate

strate. His third reason is, *the Magistrate can null a*
Obligation laid on by the Church representative: as if the
do prescribe some indifferent rites and ceremonies to
be observed by all; he forbidding them the former
posed Obligation is null; otherwise these absurdities
would follow. 1. That there are two Supreme Powers
in a Nation at once. 2. That a man lyeth under different
Obligations to the same thing. 3. The same action may be
duty and a sin, viz. Being forbidden by the one Power
and commanded by the other. *Ans.* 1. He supposeth
(which we will never yield to him) that ceremonies may be
indifferent and imposeable by men. Nay, all the Ceremonies
God's worship, being worship themselves, are Christ's
institution; otherwise but will-worship: And so his
self understandeth Ceremonies p. 68. It is like forgetting
what he here said. 2. It concerneth the Author
much as it doth us to answer his own Objection, for
ascribeth to the Church an *intrinsecal power of Discipline*.
Now suppose one be excommunicated; the Church
commandeth it, the Magistrate forbiddeth it; if the
prohibition doth not null the former Obligation, the
same absurdities follow, that are mentioned in his reason
if it doth, then this doth as much destroy the power
of Discipline in that Church, which he asserteth;
as it destroyeth the Power of determining
about other Church-matters, which we assert. 3. We
deny that the Magistrate by his power can destroy the
obligation to any Church-Act (being otherwise warrantable)
laid on by the Church, or rather by Christ, the Church
declaring his will (for so the Church only commandeth
otherwise we might as well say (and it must needs be the
Man's Opinion, if he believe what here he writeth) that
when the Church ordaineth a Minister and commandeth
him to preach Christ, the Magistrate by forbidding him
to speak any more in that name, maketh null the former
Obligation. 'Tis true the Magistrate may, in some
cases, restrain the outward exercise of what we are
obliged to, and also when he doth injuriously forb

such exercise, we may be, in some cases, obliged to
cede to this violence: but neither of these destroyeth
our Obligation to our duty; neither the power by which
is laid on; more than the Magistrate doth destroy
my Obligation to obey my Father, or his power over
me, when he putteth me in Prison, and so I cannot do
what my Father commandeth. The Absurdities that he
would fright us with, do not follow from our opinion,
but from his own false supposition. For the first, it is
not absurd that there should be two Supreme Powers about
things so different that one Power cannot have them both for
its formal Object. Will not the Author grant that Mini-
sters have the Supreme preaching power, that is not
subordinate to the Magistrate: and the Magistrate the
Supreme civil Power? Why not then, that they have
the Supreme ruling Power in Church affairs? These
Powers need not clash, though they be not subordinate,
being about things so different as are this world and that
which is to come, the Soul and the Body: But this
man feareth that *Cesar* be dethroned, if we confess Christ
to be a King; and so would have Christ's Kingdome
subordinate to *Cesar's*. For the second, there cannot be two
Obligations here; for if the Church keep within her Li-
mits, her command is Christ's. And so any contrary ob-
ligation must be null: if not, her Authority layeth on
no Obligation. For the Third, it is the same Argument,
and it admitteth of the same Answer.

§. 8. Having made the Magistrate the sole Judge and
determiner in the matters of the Church even Ceremo-
nies themselves: our Author proceedeth p. 49. to ex-
amine the extent of his Power, asserted in his former
Hypothesis, and here he proceedeth by three steps.
1. *That there are some things left undetermined by the Word.*
This we assent to, as it is here set down; but cannot
understand it (as he doth, which appeareth a little after)
of Ceremonies: but rather of bare Circumstances of the
worship of God (if he take these for one, he is very igno-
rant of the Nature of both) neither of the Species of
Church

Church-Government, for which this indifferency of things is here asserted. What he discourseth here of the Nature of indifferency, I shall not insist upon, intending to meet with it elsewhere. Only I take notice of his concession on p 53. that in *things wholly indifferent both in respect of their common nature and their use and end; that are neither commanded nor tend to the peace and order of the Church*, there can be no reason why the Nature of these things should be altered by humane Laws: wherefore matters that are indifferent as to a command, but are much conducing to the peace and order of the Church are the proper matter of humane constitution concerning the Churches Policy. Let it be here considered that these things are not properly indifferent, but commanded, viz. where the peace and order of the Church is enjoined: and if it be so, it is the part of the Church representative, not of the Magistrate, to Judge what things are thus conducing to peace and order; and to hold forth the doing of these, as the Laws of Christ.

S. 9. His second step is, that *matters of this Nature may be determined and restrained; and that it is not to the wronging of Christians liberty, so to do*: And this he doth very largely prove against some as he pretendeth of great note and learning; I wonder who they are: For I never met with any who do deny what he asserteth. It is true that many do, and that warrantably, maintain that where Christ hath left us free, man hath no Power by his meer will to restrain us; especially in things that belong to the worship of God: but all do acknowledge so far as I know, that in things (though not expressly commanded) which by their nature or circumstances are made conducing to the ends that Christ hath enjoined us to endeavour, the Church may enjoin us; and that without making any new Laws; but by declaring the will of God. This and no more do all the arguments, which the Author with much pains hath set down, conclude. And indeed, if our author had once proved the *Species of Church Government to be indifferent*, we should not deny it to be determinable and imposeable (not by

the Magistrate, but) by the Church. In the prosecution of his Arguments, there occur several things that I cannot assent to; but they not being to the Question in hand, and intending to touch some of them in a Treatise else-where, I pass them here; he hath some greedy points after obeying whatever is commanded, though unlawful; the non-obligation of the Covenant, &c. which do discover his spirit. Though the Author doth state the Question as hath been said, yet all his reasons whereby, from p. 56. he proveth the determination of indifferent things, not to take away our liberty, doth prove as much, that determination grounded on mans meer will doth not take away; for in that case there may be left a liberty of judgment; and there may be no necessity antecedent to the command; as he saith in his first Argument; also in that case, the determining of the things supposeth them to be matters of liberty, which is a second medium, and the obligation in that case, is only in respect of contempt and scandal, which is his third Argument; and the repealing of the law or ceasing of the authority commanding, may free us of impositions made by meer will, which is his fourth Argument. Wherefore these Arguments prove that which the Author doth not own, if they prove anything, which is a token that they prove nothing at all. But that I may shortly answer them. The first Argument is inconcludent; for though radical liberty, (i. e. a right to do or not do) be consistent with such commands, as men, without warrant from God, lay on us, (their authority never being able to destroy that right given to us which is founded on the will of God) yet these commands are an unlawful taking away of the exercise of our liberty: for where neither Scripture nor Reason (which are Gods law) do bind, mans will ought not to bind; especially in the things of Religion. He hath here, p. 57. a gird by the way at them who hold one posture of receiving the Lords Supper to be necessary, as more destroying liberty, than doth the command of the Magistrate imposing one posture. *Ans.* If they hold this without

warrant from the word of the Lord ; I yield to what he saith ; but if they can prove that we ought in this to imitate Christ, and keep a table-gesture as he did ; it is no destroying our liberty, unless he think it less liberty to be bound to the will of Christ, declared by his example, than it is to be bound to the will of men. Other falsehoods I pass over (it not being my intention to touch every thing) but I wonder at a gross aspersion that he layeth on the Apostle Paul, viz. *that he did use the Jewish Ceremonies, (as that he circumcised Timothy) which they were not only mortuæ but mortiferæ, and that, when there was no opinion of their necessity. What is it he pray to say they were mortifera, but that it was sin to use them? (for when they were mortua, they were indifferent, not as to the opinion of their necessity, but as to their use) then Paul used them when it was sin to use them.* I hope the Author will not own this when he is better advised : but we see whither zeal for an error will lead men. His other Arguments run on the same mistake, viz. they prove that *radical liberty is not taken away whatever be commanded* : but they prove not that when men command without warrant from the Lord, they hinder that exercise of liberty that the Lord alloweth us. Wherefore I need not insist on any further Answer to them. p. 59. He maketh this difference between *laws concerning Ecclesiastical and Civil things* ; that these bind *extra casum scandali & contemptus*, those not so ; whether this doth consist with his opinion that both these Laws are from the Magistrate, let it be considered. I thought that the different way of obligation had been from the different Authorities, not from the things about which the Laws do converse, and that violation of all the Magistrates Laws, had been alike opposite to his Authority. I mean, where the things are of equal moment, as certainly may be in things Civil, and Ecclesiastical. The wise advice of *Ambrose to Augustine* (which he citeth p. 60, 61.) I follow with *Augustine* reverence as *cæleste graculum* : so it be-
 u

understood of Customes truly indifferent: but that things we plead about, and that the Author would permit to the will of the Magistrate; are such, we cannot yield: Wherefore all this his pains about indifferent things, is to small purpose. what he saith, p. 62. of superstition in the imagined necessity of things really indifferent, I will elsewhere examine; and what others have alledged to that purpose.

§. 10. His third step is to set bounds to the restraint of Christian liberty, where his first rule is, that *nothing be imposed as necessary, but what is clearly revealed in the word of God*. But what if it be revealed, so as it is visible to them who read and search attentively; though it be not clearly revealed? must such things be slighted, as no part of Gods will? but of this we have said enough before. The second rule is, that *nothing be determined but what is sufficiently known to be indifferent in its own nature*. The way to know what is such, he maketh to be, by *taking the primitive Church, and the reformed Churches to be Judges in this*. I confess, their decision should have much weight; but we dare make none Judge, but God speaking in the Scriptures. What if Christ hath in Scripture manifested his will in a point, and yet these Churches looked on it, and used it as a thing indifferent? must we then think it indifferent? I hope not. This is to lay too much weight on men: especially considering that the mystery of iniquity (which did prostitute all most of Christs Institutions to mens will; as if they had been indifferent things) began early to work in the primitive Church, 2 *Thes.* 2. 2. and few reformed Churches want their own Lees; from which the Lord is yet daily purging them. Wherefore I think (with submission to better judgments) a surer standard, to know what is indifferent, to be this; *what cannot be proved to be determined by the Lord in Scripture, and is not of the Law of nature, neither primarily nor secondarily; what is to be thought indifferent*. Passing his other rules; in prosecuting the last, he openeth a door to *humane cere-*

monies, (though he seem to speak against them) approving the *Feast of Dedication*, the *Jewish Ceremonies in the Passover*: sure these were some more than ordinary decency; neither were to be esteemed of the same rank (as he doth) with *building of Synagogues, hours of prayer* which are meer order: the continuation of the *Passover* by *Hezekiah* which was transient; no recurrent fast; and had a reason then urgent; and the feast of *Purim* which was a Civil solemnity: and the fasts of the 4th, 5th, and 10th Months; which were occasional for the captivity, and expired with it. But of this matter treat at large elsewhere.

S. 11. In his 5th Hypothesis, there is an unwary expression, viz. that things determined, as aforesaid, by lawful authority in the Church (which to him is the Magistrate) do bind the conscience. I suppose he meant that we are bound to obey for conscience sake; and not that Civil Authority by it self doth reach the Conscience, which Protestants with good reason deny against the Papists.

The rest of his first part needeth not our Animadversions, seeing it containeth nothing contrary to Presbyterian Government; but rather asserteth several parts of it: wherefore I shall only set down briefly his Assertions, many of which are so many Concessions to us. He Asserteth, (cap. 3.) that the law of Nature dictates that there must be a society of men for the worship of God that is a Church. And (cap. 4.) that there must be a government in this society. Where he maketh 6 things of this Government to be *juris naturalis*; 1. That there be a distinction of persons, and a superiority both of power and order in some over the rest. 2. That the persons so above others have respect paid them suitable to the nature of their employment. (cap. 5.) The third thing is, that all things either pertaining to the immediate worship of God, or belonging to the Government of the Church be performed with the greatest solemnity and decency that may be, (cap. 6.) Fourthly, that there be a way agreed upon to determine and decide

the controversies arising in the Church, which immediately
 led to the breaking of the peace and unity of it. Where he
 adeth for the definitive sentence in the major part,
 where power is equal; and for liberty of appeals, where
 there is subordination; as being of natural right: and
 that this subordination must be in a Society consisting
 of many Companies or Congregations. (cap. 7.) Fifth-
 that all who are admitted unto this Society, must con-
 stantly be governed by the laws of that Society. (cap. 8.)
 Sixthly, that in a well-ordered Society, (and so in the
 Church) every offender against the rules of that Society,
 must give an account of his actions to the Governours of that
 Society; and submit to the censures of it, according to the
 judgment of the Officers of it.

All this we accept of as truth, but how this last doth
 consist with his putting all power of jurisdiction in the
 hand of the Magistrate, and leaving the Church-Officers
 only power of Preaching and Administring the Sacra-
 ments, (of which before) I cannot understand. So
 much for the first part of his *Irenicum*.

PART II. CAP. 1, 2.

IN his second part we have also some concessi-
 ons to be taken notice of, as cap. 2. p. 154.
 that there must be a Form of Government, as necessary, not
 by a civil Nature only, but by a Divine Law. This we receive as
 truth, and do thus improve it *ad hominem*: The Au-
 thor cannot shew us any express Law in Scripture, com-
 manding that there be a Form of Government in the
 Church: Neither can any Scripture ground of this truth
 be brought, but what is drawn from Apostolick pra-
 ctice; they had a Form of Government, *ergo*, so must
 we, seeing it is as needful to us as it was to them.
 Now if this be so, why doth the Author dispute so much
 against our reasoning from Apostolick practice (where
 the case is alike) for this particular Form of Govern-

ment, as being established by Divine Law? If the practice be a sufficient evidence of a Divine Law (beside the Law of Nature) for this, *that there be a Form* why is it not as significant of a Divine Law for this, *that this is the Form*; where the case of them and us is alike.

§. 2. We receive also as a concession, p. 157. *that there is a Divine Warrant for a National Church; and for a National Form of Church-Government.* Also, cap. 2. he concedeth *that the Government of the Church ought to be ministered by Officers of Divine Appointment, is of Divine Right.* Where, in one word, he destroyeth (unawares) all that he saith for maintaining the lawfulness of Episcopal Government; for he doth not deny that Bishops as ruling over Presbyters, and having more power than their Brethren, are of Humane Constitution; and they cannot be Officers of Divine appointment: If then by this Concession the Church ought not to be ruled by them; and so Episcopal Government is unlawful. I know not, if he did foresee this Argument taken out of himself: But in explaining his Concession he would fain seem to say some other thing than he has indeed said: For he saith, *that he here taketh the Church for the Members of the Church: So that his meaning is, that there must be a standing perpetual Ministry:* And this he proves largely. This doth no ways explain what he has said: For it is one thing *that it be Divine Appointment that there are Officers*; and another thing *that these Officers be such as God hath appointed.* Jeroboam when he made Priests of the lowest of the People, kept Divine Institution so far, that he made Priests; and did make that work common to all: And yet his Priests were not Officers of Divine Appointment: So neither is a Church ruled by Officers of Divine Appointment though there be Officers who rule, which is Divine Appointment; except these Officers be such as God has Instituted, and not such as men have devised. And besides this, the Law of Nature dictateth that there should be Rulers in the Church, distinct from the Ruled.

If the Law (as he had formerly observed : Wherefore he must here either trifle, or say some more, *viz.* that the Lord must appoint these sorts of Officers that should govern his Church: for the Author is here speaking of what is of Divine Positive Right; having formerly shewed what is of Divine Natural Right.

§. 3. In the third Chap. we have the Question stated; speaking of the Church as comprehending many particular Congregations, (and so excluding the Independent way from this Competition) he compareth these two forms of Government, *viz.* 1. The particular Officers of several Churches, acting in equality of power, called a Colledge of Presbyters. 2. A superiour order above the Ministry, having the Power of Jurisdiction and Ordination belonging to it. Now the Question is not whether of these cometh nearest to the primitive pattern: But whether either of them be settled by Divine Right; so as that the Church is bound to obseeve it. He holds the Negative: We the affirmative: and we say, that the former of these two is *Juris Divini*.

§. 4. For proving his opinion, he undertaketh to preserve all the Pleas which are made for the Divine Right of either of these: Five he proposeth, *viz.* 1. A former Law standing in force under the Gospel. 2. Some plain institution of a new Law under the Gospel. 3. The obligatory Nature of Apostolical practice. 4. The general sense of the primitive Church. 5. The Judgement of the chief Divines and Churches since the Reformation. Of these he discourseth severally: And we shall give our sense of them as in following him we come at them. But first I must here note a few things. 1. It is an injurious way of stating the Question about this Divine Right, to exclude any who put in for it, from the liberty of Competition: Now he knoweth that others besides these plead a Divine Right of their way; as *Erastians* will have the keys given by Christ to the Magistrate: Independents, to the Community, or at least the Officers of a particular Church (Popery is not excluded,

seeing it standeth on the same bottom with Episcopacy though I think the Resolution of the question about Divine Right, might have laid both these aside; yet I think the stating of it might have taken them in; and they might have a fair hearing; lest some by seeing Presbytery and Episcopacy laid aside as of no Divine stamp, might be tempted to take of either of the other two for Christs Government, rather than leave the matter wholly at an uncertainty, and the will of men. But I observe that though the one of these he doth altogether slight; yet the other he doth not pass, out of any misregard to it; for he laboureth to take all power by Christs gift, out of the hands of Presbyters and Bishops, that the Magistrate might have it *in solidum*.

§. 5. 2. I observe, for further clearing the state of the Question, that all other parts of these two forms of Government, are confessed to be *juris divini, vel naturalis, vel positivi*, (as from his concessions have been manifest, and will yet more appear) only the matter of Parity or Superiority of Ministers is in question: and it being so, I propose this to be considered: that Parity be of Divine Right, it is sufficient, 1. That Christ hath given power to all Ministers to rule the Church. 2. That he hath not given a greater share of it to some than to others. 3. That it is his will that as he hath distributed this power equally, so that no man make it unequal; seeing that cannot be but by taking from the rest what Christ hath given them, and giving to one what he hath not given him. If these three be granted, Parity of Power is Christs Will, and so of Divine Right. Now our Author agreeth to the first two as Truth: For the first he asserteth *in terminis*; the second he cannot deny, while he asserteth Superiority not to be *juris divini*; the question then is only about the third, *viz.* When Christ hath given equal power to his Ministers, whether men may make it unequal, by subjecting one of them to another; abridging the power of one, and enlarging the power of another: Or which is all one; whe-

whether it be in the power of men, when Christ hath made but one Officer: to set up another of their own devising, who shall have a power that Christ never gave to any Officer in his Church? I am sure, we have a clear advantage; that Presbyters acting in Parity, keep themselves within the bounds of Christs Institution; and can shew his warrant for so doing; whereas setting up a Bishop over them is without that line, and can be warranted by no divine Institution. Let it then be considered whether of these is the safest way for us to take.

6. 6. 3. I take notice that the Pleas that he ennumerateth for a particular form of Government, are not all which may be alledged; there may be many significations of the will of God in Scripture, that are neither set down in the plain terms of a Law, nor expressed by Apostolical practice. We draw good consequences from Promises, Reproofs, &c. which may shew us what is our duty. 4. Let it be minded that it is not needful for asserting of Divine Right, that we prove it from all these Topicks: one demonstration that it is the will of God that such a thing be, is sufficient. 5. The question being stated as before, the probation will be incumbent upon him, who asserteth that it is lawful for men to make them unequal in power, whom Christ hath made Pairs: we assert that the power of Ministers that is of Divine Right, is equal; which the Author doth not deny: he asserteth further, that men may restrain this Power in some, and enlarge it in others; for this he must shew warrant; for *affirmant, incumbit probatio*: we deny it; and here we might rest, till it can be shewed that Christ hath given such power to men, to cut and carve in his Institutions. The *Divine Right of Parity* is built on the *want of Divine Right of Imparity*. Notwithstanding we hope, (*ex abundanti*) to make other Pleas for it stand good, which he laboureth to make void.

S. 7. The first plea from a *standing Law in the Jewish Church* we do not insist on, knowing that in matters of
Insti-

Institution, the Old Testament is no pattern for the New. Neither are we obliged to insist on this Plea, as he alledgeth, because some of ours do some times make use of their Example, as in proving a subordination of Courts: For 1. It is not instituted, but of the law of Nature; supposing once the unity of more Congregations: now what is taught by Nature may well be confirmed to us by the Law of God to the *Jews*; though we be not bound by that law, where there is not that reason. Again, *Jewish* example should have weight with us, where their case is not peculiar; seeing their practice came from an Infinitely wise Lawgiver: but this holdeth not in imparity, or subordination of Officers: It is known that the High Priest was Typical: that the Priesthood was annexed to one Tribe, for a peculiar Reason: these things do not concern us.

C H A P. IV.

HE cometh to the second Plea for a particular form of Government, *viz. Christs instituting it by a new Law*, where he alledgeth, that *it is more hotly pleaded by many, that Christ must do it, than that he hath done it*. This is a mis-representation, to say no worse. If it be not proved by the Assertors of Presbyterian Government, that Christ hath instituted that form of Government, let their cause fall to the ground. We are ready to acknowledge that it were rashness, and a limiting of the Holy One, to say that he must institute a particular form; if we were not otherwise satisfied that he hath done it. But being convinced of that; we may be very much confirmed in our Opinion, by the consideration of these arguments, that hold forth, how fit, and how suitable to the wisdom of God, and the Administration of Christs Gospel Kingdom it is, that he should make this course, and not leave the affairs of his House to mans will, or

just rather. This is not prescribing to him ; but declaring of the fitness of what he hath done. Moreover, we do not, neither ever did we argue barely from the necessity of a particular form to be instituted by Christ, considering the thing it self only : but from some Scripture ground holding forth the necessity of it. Now if the Lord in the contrivance of the Gospel hath made it necessary to his design that there be a form of his appointment, and hath signified this to us by his word : it is no rashness to assert the necessity of it ; even though we could not (through our darkness) certainly determine what is that form, in all the particulars of it. But I come to examine what he hath said against the Reasons that our Authors do bring for the fitness of a particular form of Christs instituting.

§. 2. The first of them is taken from comparing Christ the Lawgiver under the New Testament, with *Moses* under the Old Testament ; and it is thus instituted, *Heb.* 3. 2, 5, 6. That as *Moses* was faithful in that House, as a Servant ; much more was Christ as a Son ; if then *Moses* was so faithful as to declare the Will of God concerning the Government of the Church, and that particularly what Form should be used, we must not think that Christ hath left this undone. To this he answereth, 1. *Faithfulness is the discharge of a Trust : So that the faithfulness of Christ and Moses lyeth in doing the Work that the Lord laid on them : and this was to be Mediators, the one Typical the other True. Moses had the Pattern shewed him in the Mount, and therefore faithfulness required that he should settle that Form, and no other : But it cannot be made appear that Christ hath any Command from his Father of settling one Form of Government. So he, p. 176. To which I reply, 1. Our Argument may be so laid, as this Answer doth not at all touch it, thus ; It is the Will of God (and so entrusted to the care of Christ) that there should be a Government in the Church ; as is confessed by our Author : This Government must be managed, hic & nunc, in some particular Form, as sense and reason teacheth :*

teacheth : Now that Christ might be faithful as *Moses* was in the discharge of this Trust, it was needful that he should set down a particular Form to be used by all; or appoint some who should determine what the particular Form should be. But according to this mans opinion, he hath done neither of these : Not the first, for that he pleadeth against : Nor the second, for our Author can shew us no Scripture where it is intrusted to any ; And if we should require a plain and direct Law for this, in expresse and formal terms, as he doth of us in the like case ; he would find it a hard task : Besides, if we consult Scripture, there is far more to be said for the power of the Church, than for the power of the Magistrate in such a determination : And reason also may, at least, set them in equal competition, if not cast the Scales in the favour of the Church, it being a matter purely Ecclesiastical, that is contended about ; and yet this man giveth the deciding power in this to the Magistrate. It is strange if the Government of the Church under the Old Testament be so plain, and that under the New be left at such uncertainty.

§. 3. 2. That *Moses* and Christ are compared as Mediators, I do not deny : but this maketh nothing for, but against what he intendeth : For their Mediatory Work taketh in the management of all the dealings that are between God and his People ; and (as it is here spoken of) is chiefly meant of outward Administrations, of Teaching and Ruling : For the inward Administrations of satisfaction for sin, and communicating the Spirit to Believers, are not applicable to *Moses* : Now the settling the Government of the Church cannot but be a part of this Mediatory work, it being of so much and so near concernment to the spiritual good of believers : Wherefore Christ and *Moses* are here compared in their faithfulness, in settling of Church-Government as well as in other things. This is clearly confirm'd out of the 5th v. of that chap. where it is said, that *Moses* was faithful in all his house : Then the Law of Comparison
faith

With that Christ is also there said to be faithful in all his House, i. e. in all the matters of the Church : Now it cannot be denied, but Church-Government is one, and that a main one, of the matters of the Church. Wherefore Christ and *Moses* are here compared in their faithfulness, in this Administration. 3. His Answer doth not well hang together, when first he will have them here compared as Mediators, as if the matter of Church-Government were impertinent to that wherein they are compared ; and yet subjoyneth, that *Moses* his faithfulness lay in keeping close to the pattern shewed him : Whereas Christ had no such command laid on him, nor pattern shewed him. If the faithfulness of *Moses* did lie in keeping Gods command, about Church-Government ; how is he only spoken of as a Typical Mediator ? and how is Christ's faithfulness compared with this faithfulness of *Moses*, seeing he received no such command ?

§. 4. 'Tis false, that Christ received no Command about the Government of the Church : for the Scripture is clear that he is made head of the Church ; hath the Government laid on his shoulders ; hath received all power in Heaven and in Earth, &c. If he be by his Office King of the Church, sure it is his Office and Trust to settle the Government of his Church. This reply he maketh to himself, and answereth to it (p. 177.) in two or three things : First, he granteth that Christ is King of his Church, and doth govern it outwardly by his Laws, and inwardly by his Spirit ; but we must not therefore say that one Form of Government is necessary, whether it be contained in his Laws, or dictated by his Spirit or not. To this I reply, 1. Neither do we make any such Inference : If we prove not one Form to be contained in his Laws, we shall pass from this Argument. That which we say is, that because he is King, and a faithful King, as *Moses* was, who settled a Form of Government, therefore a Form is contained in his Laws : Not that it is necessary whether it be contained in his Laws or not. 2. If

Christ

Christ be King and Governs the Church by his Laws, and that outwardly; how can it be that the particular Form of its Government is what many may think fit, and not of Christs Institution? For the Church is governed by a particular Form, not by a general notion of a Government (for *universale non existit nisi in suis singularibus*) if then the particular form be of mans appointing, the Church is not outwardly governed by Christs Laws, but by mens; for men make the Laws, or Rule of its Government. If a King should send a Deputy to Govern a Nation, and give him leave to choose what Form of Government he would, either by himself, or by a Council where he should have but equal power with the rest: it could not be said in proper speech, that that Nation is Governed by the Kings Laws (for he makes not the Laws of its Government) but by the Laws of them who determines the particular Form of Government. Yea, suppose the King should make some Laws about it, as that nothing should be acted contrary to his Will, or Interest, that there should be Government, and not Anarchy, that there should be Rulers, and Ruled, &c. Yet the Nation may rather be said to be Governed by the Laws of him who determineth the particular Form: seeing the Government doth essentially consist in the management of a particular Form, and not in some general directions. This is easily applicable to our case: for our Author will have Christ to give some General directions about Church-Government, and men to determine and contrive the Form: Now let any judge then, whether the Church in that case be Governed by the Laws of Christ, or the Laws of men. Wherefore I conclude that this Answer destroys it self while it denyeth a *particular Form instituted by Christ*, and yet will have the Church outwardly governed by his Laws.

2. He saith, the *main original of mistakes here, is the confounding of the external and internal government of the Church of Christ: and thence, whensoever men read of Christs power, authority and government, they fancy it re-*

s, and
 Form
 d not
 ed by
 Go-
 ulari-
 ating,
 Laws,
 of in
 o Go-
 Form
 by a
 ch the
 t that
 makes
 ws o
 govern
 Law
 to his
 nent
 d Ru-
 e Go-
 parti-
 ntially
 , and
 licable
 o give
 ment
 ow le
 oe Go-
 men-
 it self
 ist, and
 Law
 he con-
 of the
 read
 it re-
 fir-

ders to the outward government of the Church of God, which
 intended of this internal Mediatory power over the hearts
 and consciences of men. Reply. We are willing to dis-
 tinguish these; and I believe he cannot shew any of
 ours who do confound them: yea, we will go further in
 distinguishing the outward and inward Government of
 the Church than he doth: and I may retort this charge
 on himself, hoping to make it appear that he confound-
 eth these two, and that this is the ground of his mistakes.
 The Government of the Church is then two-fold: In-
 ward, and Outward: both these may be distinguished ac-
 cording to divers objects of this Government: for In-
 ward Government is either that which is exercised in the
 conscience; and so is invisible: or that which is exercised in
 the Church, or in matters that are properly spiritual
 and not civil; though they be visible to men, and so
 outward in respect of the conscience. So outward
 Government is either such in respect to the conscience,
 and it is that we have now described; or outward in re-
 spect to the Church, viz. That that which is exercised
 in matters relating to the Church, and yet are not pro-
 perly spiritual but civil, and concern the Church, not
 as it is a Church but as it is a Society. Or we may di-
 stinguish thus, the Government of the Church is either
 invisible, viz. in the conscience; or visible; and this
 either in things that are Ecclesiastical, and so it is in-
 ward in respect to the Church: or in things that are Ci-
 vil, and so it is outward. The first of these is imme-
 diately exercised by Christ; the second mediately, and
 that by the Guides of the Church, as his Deputies; the
 third by the Magistrate as a servant of Christ in his
 Kingdom that he hath over all the World. I hope now
 the outward and inward Government of the Church of
 Christ is sufficiently distinguished, and not so con-
 founded as to be the cause of mistakes about it. But
 now let us see whether he himself, who chargeth others
 with this confounding, be not guilty of it; and doth
 not here mistake the truth by confounding the Internal
 and

and the External Government of the Church. It is evident that it is so: for, 1. He setteth down the terms of a distinction between internal and external Government; but doth not tell what he meaneth by either of them: Whether the distinction be to be applyed to the Conscience, and so be meant of invisible and vifible Government: Or to the Church, and so be understood of Ecclesiastical and formal, or of Civil and Objective Government of the Church: We are to seek in this for all his distinction. 2. He seemeth confusedly to refer to both these, as he here manageth the distinction: or at least, some things seem to draw the one way and some the other: For when he denyeth Christs power and Authority, spoken of in the Scripture, to refer to the outward Government of the Church, this must be meant of that Government which is Civil, and of vifible Ecclesiastical Government. I hope he will not deny that to be a part of Christs Authority. Again where he granteth Christs internal mediatory power over the Conscience; this must be meant of his invisible Government; both because it is certain Christ hath such a Power, and our Author here denyeth all other power of Government to him: Also because no other power is internal over the Conscience but this. But what ever be his meaning, this answer doth not take away the force of our argument, for if he deny the Scripture that speak of Christs power, Kingdom, and Authority, to be meant of Civil power, but to be meant of vifible internal power in the Church; this is all we desire; for if Christ hath such a Kingdom; then the management of the vifible Government of the Church is his trust; in which his faithfulness would make him settle a particular form as *Moses* did. Only I take notice how inconsistent this is with his Principles, seeing he denyeth any vifible power in the Church (save that of Word and Sacraments, as it followeth immediately) and putteth all other power in the hand of the Magistrate, as do all the rest of the *Erastians*. If he deny the

scriptures, that speak of Christ's Authority and King-
 dom, to be meant of Visible Ecclesiastical Government,
 and make them speak only of an invisible Government
 over the Conscience; which is exercised by his Word
 and Spirit; in this first he is contrary to all men, for
 even *Erastians* themselves do grant that Christ hath such
 Kingdom; but they would have it managed by the
 Magistrate; whom they make Christ's Vicegerent in
 his Mediatory Kingdom: and others do hold such a
 Kingdom of Christ, and that it is managed by the Of-
 ficers of his Church. Secondly, he derogateth from
 the Kingdom of Christ, denying that which is a con-
 siderable part of the exercise of his Kingly Office:
 What? is Christ a King, not only of Angels, but of
 Men, united in a visible Society, the Church; and yet
 hath no visible Government exercised in his name a-
 mong them? this is a ridiculous inconsistency. Third-
 ly, he is contrary to many Scriptures which speak of
 Christ's Kingdom and Authority; and must be under-
 stood of a visible Authority exercised in a visible Go-
 vernment; such as *Eph. 4. 10, 11.* Setting up of Pastors
 here mentioned is a visible act: and it is made an act of
 his Authority, *1 Cor. 11. 3.* Christ's Headship is men-
 tioned with a reference to the ordering the visible de-
 cency of his Worship. Also, *Psal. 2. 8. Psal. 22. 27.*
Psal. 110. 3. Col. 1. 13. and many other places; which
 is strange daring to restrict to the invisible exercise
 of Christ's Authority in the soul. Fourthly, this is con-
 trary to all these Scriptures which speak of the several
 outward acts of the exercise of Christ's Government;
gathering a people to him, Isa. 55. 4, 5. Acts 15. 14,
16, 17. giving them laws, Isa. 33. 2. Mat. 28. 20.
Mat. 5. 17, 19. Verses, &c. setting up Officers, Eph. 4.
11. giving them power of Discipline, Mat. 16. 19.
Mat. 18. 17, 18. John 20. 23. Fifthly, it is contrary
 to himself; for Preaching and Administering Sacraments
 are visible acts: if then Christ as King hath invested

his Servants with this power (which he confesseth
 177. where also he confesseth that he Governeth the
 Church outwardly by his Laws) he must have a visi-
 ble Government as he is King of his Church. That
 which he addeth, *viz.* that this is made known to us in
 the word, but not the other; *viz.* that he hath ap-
 pointed a particular Form: this I say, 1. Beggeth the
 Question. 2. Destroyeth his Answer, wherein he de-
 nyeth Christ's visible Government; for this is a part
 of it, which he granteth.

§. 5. Another Answer he frameth to our Argument
 from Christ and Moses, p. 177. *That if the comparison of*
Christ and Moses infer an equal exactness of disposing every
thing in the Church; then we must be bound to all circum-
stances as the Jews were: but there is this difference between
the Old and New Testament; that there all ceremonies and
circumstances were exactly prescribed; here there are only
general rules for circumstantial things; there, the very parts
of the Tabernacle were commanded; here it is not so, but
liberty is left for times, place, persons, &c. Reply,
 We do not plead for an equal exactness in determin-
 ing all things: We know the Old and New Testamen-
 state of the Church requireth a diversity here: but we
 plead for the equal faithfulness of Christ with Moses;
 now Christ was intrusted with setting up a Government
 in the Church as well as Moses; whence it followeth
 that he behoved to enjoin the particular Form of it
 as Moses did: seeing without this, great matters in the
 Church, even that whereon its Union and Being, as a
 Society, do hang, are left at a great uncertainty, and
 exposed to the will of man, who may and readily will
 erre. 2. The difference that he maketh between the
 Law and the Gospel is most false, *viz.* That there
 all circumstances of worship were determined, here not
 so: yea, it is with more truth observed by some that
 more circumstances of worship, were left to the pro-
 vident

place of men under the Law, then now under the Gospel: For every one of their actions imposed; as sacrifices, washings, &c. had of necessity abundance of circumstances attending them; as when, how, with what Instruments, &c. Wherefore the more ordinances there were, the more circumstances undetermined. There is indeed this difference; that God under the Law did by his command place Religion in many natural circumstances of worship; as in the day of Circumcision, of killing the Passover, &c. and so set them above the degree of meer circumstances, which he hath not done under the Gospel: but it doth not follow that all things, even of greatest moment to Church-Order, and the worship of God are now left free, because we have not so many Ceremonies as the Jews had; for those circumstances, which are of Civil and common concernment to Religion, and other actions, be left to prudence, and matters relating to the Government of the Church, which are of that nature, be also left free: yet we must not for that, think that the Government itself, as managed, even the substance of it (which must be in a particular Form, seeing a general notion of Government is not practicable) is left to the will of men. I hope our Author will not say that the Form of Government is a circumstance, neither ought he to say that it is a thing of common concernment to the Church and other Societies: The Church is a Society singular, and of another Nature than others, *Cant. 6.9. she is but one, the only one of her Mother*, therefore her Government must be suitable; wherefore it ought not to be put in, in the same case with the Natural circumstances that accompany all our actions; which were the Author most unwisely doth.

§. 6. For a third answer he bringeth reasons why all *Montillio's* (as he is pleased to speak) should not be now determined as they were under the Law. In this we do not

contradict him, as appeareth from what is now said: *Quere non respondes ad rem?* Neither is it savoury to account the form of Government, by which the visible being of the Church doth stand, a punctillio: Such a diminutive expression is not without contempt. But let us hear his Reasons: The first, p. 179. is taken from the perfection of the Gospel-State above the Jewish: *That Church needed the fescues of Ceremonies to direct her, and must have every part of her Lesson set her: This must not be still sub ferula, and not dare to vary in any Circumstance which doth not concern the thing it self. As boy a at School hath his Lesson and the manner of learning it prescribed: At the University, more general directions do serve. In the Church every circumstance was determined; in this things moral remain in force, but circumstantial are left more a liberty.*

Ans. 1. The point in question is not here touched: 'Tis not questioned whether the Gospel-Church should be loaded with Ceremonies as was the Jewish; nor whether in every Circumstance she be bound by a Law (though he doth falsely suppose that the Jewish Church was bound in every Circumstance, as I have already shewed) but rather whether she be bound in any thing besides the moral Law: And particularly whether she be bound to a form of Church Government. Such loose declamations as this, aggravating some absurdities impertinent to the thing in hand, are no solid refutations. I hope the Church may be bound to a particular form of Government, viz. to parity of Ministers, and yet have liberty in abundance of circumstances. His example of a School-boy, and one at the University; of a Son when a Child, and when at Age, makes nothing against us: For in both Cases they are in subjection to some positive commands of the Master or Father: So is the Gospel-Church under some such Commands, though not so many as the Jews were. 2. Is it contrary to Gospel-perfection to be under the Commands of Christ as to a Form of Church Government,

ent, and to be ruled by a way of his contriving? This must be a strange kind of perfection that he dreameth of. We believe that the Church is yet so perfect, and will be while on Earth, that she hath need to be Governed by Christs Laws; and is far happier in that Case, then if she were left to chuse her own way in matters of so great Concernment as is the Form of Church Government. 3. Is it not as contrary, and more, to the perfection of the Gospel-Church to be under a form of Government, imposed by the Magistrate (as this man would have us) then if it be imposed by Christ? Sure Christs Yoke is easier then mens; and his device must be better then theirs. Indeed in things that concern one Church and not another, it is better that the prudence of Governours doth determine, then that there be an Universal Law binding all: But in things that are equally good to all; it is better to be under Christs General, then mans particular Law. Now the thing in debate, Parity or Imparity among Ministers is attended with the same conveniences, or inconveniences, in all Countries and Conditions, and while men are prone to Tyranny on the one hand and to divisions on the other: Wherefore it is no ways unfit that Christ should here decide the matter by a general Law. 'Tis not like the Time or place of meeting, which must vary in divers places: Neither can he shew us any reason, why it should be one way in one Church, and another way in another, except mans pleasure, which is a bad Rule in the matters of Christ. 4. Whereas he saith that *in the Gospel Church things moral remain in their force; but circumstantial are left at more liberty*: I suppose he meaneth Natural morality, or things contained in the moral Law; and not things that have any morality, or goodness by any Law of God: for if he meant this latter, he doth but trifle; for his meaning must be, that things which are not determined by any Law, and have neither good nor evil in

them, are left at liberty; which who doth not know. Neither can he say that it was otherwise in the Jewish Church as this his assertion must imply, if that be his meaning. If he mean the former (as certainly he doth) then, 1. it is an ill division of things that belong to the Church, in Morals and Circumstantials: Be there no Christs positive institutions which belong to neither of these kind? The Lord's Supper is no more thing in this sence; neither, I hope, is it a Circumstantial thing that is left at liberty. 2. If he call all things Circumstantial which are not thus moral; and assert that to be left at liberty; he doth at one blow cut off all the institutions of Christ, and will have the Gospel-Church so perfect as to be under no law of God, but the moral Law, and what Laws men please to add unto it. I hope he will retract when he considereth what he hath here asserted: For I perceive, that even learned men can say sometimes they know not what.

§. 7. His second reason, p. 180. is this, *The Form of government among the Jews in the Tribe of Levy was agreeable to the form of Government among the other Tribes; and their Ecclesiastical Government was one of their Judicial Laws: Wherefore, if in this we compare Christ with Moses we must hold it needful that he prescribe also a form of Civil Government.*

Ans. 1. When we compare Christ with Moses, we have a very good cause to make an exception where the Scripture hath evidently made it. We compare them together as two Mediators, entrusted with managing the affairs which concern mens Eternal Salvation; among which are Church Administrations: Hence there is Warrent for stretching that comparison made of them in Scripture to their faithfulness in appointing Church Government; but as to Civil Government the Scripture maketh a plain exception, when it evidently holdeth forth

Moses a State Law-giver as, well as a Church-Law-giver; and it doth as evidently testifie that Christ was not such; when he denieth his Kingdom to be of this World, *Joh. 18. 36.* And that he is a Judge and divider of inheritance among men, *Luk. 12. 14.* and his mean condition in the World (unlike to *Moses*) maketh this farther appear.

Wherefore there is no necessity of comparing them in Civil, though we compare them in Church-Administrations. The Lord was pleased to make the Government of *Israel*, in respect of Church and State, both, to be *Theocrátia*; to give them both kinds of Laws immediately from himself: That seeing he hath under the Gospel done otherwise, as to State-Government, he hath also done otherwise as to Church-Government; what a mad kind of consequence is this? And there is evident reason of this differing Dispensation under the Law, and under the Gospel. I suppose if the difference of cases that arise from variety of Circumstances did permit; it were the happiest case for God's People to have all their actions and concerns particularly determined by the Lord, who is wiser then men: now the Lord doth thus with them, so far as it hinders not their happiness, by a load of multiplicity of Laws: Wherefore, seeing the Church and State of the Jews were commensurable, being in one Nation, it was as easie for them to have their State-Laws determined by the Lord as their Church-Laws: But it is far otherwise under the Gospel, where the Church is spread over so many different Nations, of divers dispositions and manners; to have determined all things for the Civil Good of all these Nations, which must be superadded. To the Determinations of Nature's Law, would have made the Bible a burthen to men.

But it is not so in Ecclesiastical matters, there is nothing peculiar to the Church as a Church, or Religious Society, but (supposing what Nature Dictates) may without burthening People with many Laws, be determined and imposed upon all.

Hence is it that the Lord saw it for the good of the Jewish Church, to give them both Civil and Church-Laws; and for the good of the Gospel Church to give them Church-Laws; but to leave Civil-Laws to prudence guided by the general Rules of Scripture and Nature. Neither do I think (as our Author seemeth sometime to think) that it was any part of legal bondage to have Laws from God, even in the least matters: and that which is Christian liberty to be free from Gods Laws in these things, when we are bound to the same by the Laws of men: I should rather prefer their state to ours, thus far: but their bondage was, to have many things determined and imposed upon them which were naturally indifferent, and so free: which the Lord hath now left free under the Gospel.

Answ. 2. It is not to the purpose to tell us, that the Government of the Tribe of Levy was like that of the other Tribes: For Church-Government was very different from Civil Government for all that, viz. in this, that it was in the hand of the Tribe of Levy, and not of other Tribe, which was a positive Institution of God: that it did *cognosce* of other matters than Civil Government did: that it did inflict other censures. But let it be never so coincident with Civil Government, yet it was of Gods

Gods Institution, which is all that is needful
 our purpose. That *the Form of Ecclesiastical*
Government took place among them, as one of their
Judicial Laws, is a groundless Assertion: Yea,
 it is a begging of the Question, and also taking
 away the Distinction of Church and State a-
 mong the Jews, which is not needful here to
 be insisted upon, till some man Answer what
 Mr. Gillespie in his *Aarons-rod* hath written to
 this purpose.

8. His third Reason, *ib.* is, *the People of the Jews were*
entire People when their Church-Government was settled:
the Gospel Church was but in Forming in Christs and the A-
postles times: they settled what was for the present need of
the Church in her first Constitution, as in appointing Offi-
cers; this will not serve when the Church is grown, and
spread: her coat cut out for her Infancy must not be urg'd on
her when grown.

Ans. 1. This doth no way satisfie the comparing of
 Christ's faithfulness with *Moses*; for *Moses* gave Laws
 in the Wilderness, not only for that wandring condi-
 tion, but for their settled state in the Land of *Canaan*.
 Must we then think that Christ took care that the Church
 in infancy should have his Laws to be guided by, but
 afterward to be left to the Dictates of men? Sure our
 Lord was as careful to foresee future needs of his Peo-
 ple, as to provide for present wants.

2. The Church in the Apostles days, though not so
 spread as now, yet was so multiplyed and settled, as
 that

that she was capable to be ruled by Parity or Primacy. Might there not be a Bishop in *Ephesus*, *Corinth*, and especially in *Galatia*, a National Church? Might there not be a College of Presbyters then as well now? Wherefore, if the Apostles provided for present need, they behoved either to determine either these two, *ex ore tuo*.

3. What is there in our case that maketh another kind of Government needful, then what was needful in the Apostles times? We have many Congregations which all need their several Officers, and must be ruled in common; either by all these Officers, or by one set above the rest: was not this their case too? I will not say I can fain know where lyeth the difference: may be in that there could not then be one Head over all the Churches which now may, seeing the powers of the world prevaile against Christ. It is true, there was a time when Government could not be settled, *viz.* When first a Church was planted, and Believers very few: But I am sure it was otherwise in many places before the Apostles departed this life.

4. Must we say then that the Directions in the Epistles to *Tim.* and *Pet.* and elsewhere, concerning Church-ministration, do not concern us; but their force expired with that time? I must see stronger Arguments than any that this Author hath brought, ere I be persuaded of this: and yet it doth clearly follow, contrary to what he he saith. Yea, we must say that these Scriptures which tell us what Officers should be in a Church, as, *Eph.* 4. 12. *1 Cor.* 12. 28. *Rom.* 12. 6, 7, do not reach us: but it is lawful for the Magistrate (in this mans opinion) to appoint what Church-Officers

Prin
 imb,
 ? Ma
 as we
 for p
 either
 anketh fit for this time, as the Apostles did for their
 e. For he saith, p. 181. the *Apostles looked at the pre-
 state of the Church, in appointing Officers.* This I
 pe sober men will not readily yield to: Yea, he is
 ainst himself, as we have seen before, and may have
 occasion further to shew afterward.

a ano
 nee
 egat
 st be
 by f
 I w
 in
 hur
 d pro
 ern
 as pl
 is co
 ed
 §. 9. His fourth and last Reason is, p. 181. the Jews
 ed under one civil Government, according to which
 e Church Government was framed and tempered:
 t Christians live under different civil Governments;
 erefore if we compare Christ with *Moses* in this, we
 ust say that Christ did frame the Church Government
 cording to the Civil; and so it must not be one but
 vers.

Ans. It is here boldly supposed, but not proved that
 e form of the Jewish Church Government, was framed
 cording to the Civil, which we deny, and so raze the
 oundation of this Reason. And whereas his assertion
 ants proof; our denial shall stand on surer ground:
 or the Civil Government among the Jews was often
 changed: they had Judges, Kings, Governors under
 heir Conquerors: but we read not of changing their
 Church Government, which behoved to have been,
 ad it been framed according to the Civil. Where-
 ore neither must Christian Church-Government be
 ormed by the Civil, but by Christs Institution.

§. 10. To these answers to our Argument, he ad-
 deth, *ex abundanti*, as he speaketh, some Arguments to
 prove the Antithesis, *viz.* that Christ did never intend
 to institute any one Form of Government. He might
 have

have spared this his supererrogation, except he had been more to say for taking off the strength of our Argument then we have met with. But to his Argument the first p. 181 and 182. he frameth thus; what binds the Church as an Institution of Christ, must bind as a Universal standing Law: one Form of Government cannot so bind, *ergo, prob. min.* what binds as a Law must either be expressed as a Law in direct terms; or deduced by necessary consequence, as of an universal binding nature: The first cannot be produced; The second is not sufficient; except the consequence be necessary, and also the obligation of what is drawn by consequence be expressly set down in Scripture: for consequences cannot make Institution, but apply it to particular cases: because positives being indifferent, Divine Institution must be directly brought for their binding so that no consequence can bind us to them, without express declaration that it shall so bind. This is no new Argument, it is proposed by him p. 12. and answered by us p. — to what is said there, I shall add a little applied to his Argument, as here framed, his major is not so evident but that it needeth a distinction to clear it. What bindeth as Christs Institution must bind as an universal Law, *i. e.* in all times and places, *negativum* for there are cases in which the Lord will admit, and necessity will impose a dispensation with some of God's Institutions, as I exemplified before in the case of *Hezekiah* keeping the Pascheover; *i. e.* in all times where God or Nature doth not make a clear exception; or where the present case doth not exempt it self from the intent of that, as being given in a far different condition, *conceditur*. Hence there were some of Christs Laws for the Church, temporal; some peculiar to some cases: these do not bind us, all the rest do, where they are possibly practicable. That the Laws for parity of Offices in the Church are of the latter sort, we maintain

his *Minor*, we deny it, and for the disjunctive proof
 it we are ready to maintain both the parts which he
 argueth. And, First, That there is exprefs Law of
 Christ for parity : which I wonder he should so barely
 say that it can be produced ; when he knoweth or
 that know that it is brought by our Writers out of
 20. 25, 26. *Lu.* 22. 25, 26. But what he hath to
 against the evidence brought from these and other
 ces, we shall examine ; when we come at them.
 Though there were no exprefs Law for it, we main-
 tain that there is abundant evidence drawn by conse-
 quence from Scripture to shew that this is the Will and
 of Christ : as for these two conditions that he re-
 queth in such a consequence ; the first we own and
 maintain, that it is inferred by clear consequence from
 Scripture that there ought to be a parity among Mini-
 sters, thus ; what was the practice of the Apostles in
 the Church Government, should be ours also, ex-
 cept the case be different ; but the Apostles did settle
 Ministers in equal power, without a Bishop over
 them : neither is there any difference in our case that
 should cause us to do otherwise ; *ergo*, we ought so to
 do. It is not needful to insist here on the confir-
 mation of this Argument, seeing we are here only asser-
 ting that this conclusion may be proved ; not underta-
 king the proof of it : which is fully done by Presbyte-
 rian Writers, and which we are ready to defend against
 this Author will object. For the second condi-
 tion, that what is drawn by consequence be exprefsly
 set down in Scripture as binding : this is unlike Mr.
Hugues's ability to require such a ridiculous condi-
 tion if it be exprefsly set down in Scripture as bind-
 ing, then it is not a consequence but an exprefs Law ;
 so belongs to the former part of his disjunction.
 Besides, it is a hard task to put any one upon, to
 find out a consequence so deduced in Scripture :
 What

What if *Anabaptists*, who deny consequences from Scripture in the point of Institution, should put Mr. *Sell* fleet to prove Infant Baptism by such a consequence: this: where something is said in Scripture, from which duty of Baptizing Infants doth clearly follow; and where it is expressly said in Scripture, that it doth follow from this, that Infants must be baptized; would find this an hard task, and yet he requireth the same of us. What he saith for the warranting of a strange Doctrine, wanteth force. It is true Consequences cannot make an Institution, yet they may declare an Institution: we may gather the Will of Christ in matters of Institutions by Scripture consequences well as in points of Truth. And though Positives indifferent, it is not needful that Divine Institutions be directly declared; for their binding; seeing it is the Will of God revealed that bindeth us, not his Will revealed in such or such terms. He were a bad Servant that would do nothing of his Masters Will, but what he declareth to him directly, and in the Impartial Mood: such Servants to God this Author would have us, that so we may have the greater latitude to be Servants of Men; taking their Will instead of Divine Institution.

§. 11. His second Argument, p. 182. is this; All standing Laws for Church Government in Scripture may be applyed to several forms, *ergo*, there is no one Form prescribed. For proof of this, he reduceth all the Laws about Church Government to these three heads:
 1. Such as set down the qualification of Officers. 2. Such as require a right managing of their Office. 3. Such as lay down Rules for the managing their Office. In these he insisteth distinctly. Before I come to what

with on these three Heads; let me answer general
 the Argument. And first by standing Laws, I sup-
 the meaneth such as are expressly set down in the
 of Laws: and then we deny his consequence, for
 gh these do only respect Government, in its more
 ral consideration, yet that doth not hinder but the
 es of it may be determined another way, viz. by
 colick practices, or consequences drawn from
 ture. 2. Though we should grant that all the
 s set down in Scripture are equally applicable to
 r form, yet the one Form, viz. Parity may be de-
 mined in Scripture thus. Parity and Episcopacy do
 e in many things; suppose then they agree in all that
 mmanded in Scripture; and that Episcopacy be so
 warrantable: no wonder that they be not discrimi-
 d by these Laws; but then here comes the differ-
 es; Parity requireth no more for its establishment,
 these Scripture Laws: and so it holdeth it self with-
 the bounds of Divine Institution; but Episcopacy
 h beyond this boundary, by setting up a new Offi-
 in the Church which the Scripture knoweth not;
 so one Form is determined, though not by any Law
 stemming the other expressly; yet by the Laws that
 rant it; and the want of any Law to warrant the
 r. 3. We deny that all the Scripture Laws redu-
 e to these three Heads, do relate to either Form, in
 wherein they differ. But let us hear his proofs.
 beginneth with the first Head, p. 183. where, I con-
 that all the qualifications of Persons which he men-
 eth may be applied to either Bishop or Presbyter.
 then, 1. This is an Argument that Bishop and Pres-
 er are one, or rather that there is no such distinction
 the Will of Christ; for sure there are distinct qua-
 ations required, the one being to Rule, the other to
 ey: wherefore if the Apostles had thought there
 might

might be both Bishops and Presbyters in the Church; surely he would have set down the qualities of a Bishop as he is distinguished from a Presbyter, as well as he setteth down the qualities of a Presbyter. *Confratrum*, a man may be a well qualified Presbyter acting under a Bishop, and yet not qualified to be a Bishop; wherefore if the Apostle had thought it lawful to set the one over the other, his qualifications of Church Officers are very lame, seeing he doth not shew us who among the Presbyters is fittest to be made my Lord Bishop; as well as he sheweth who among the People are fit to be Presbyters. 2. The Laws concerning qualifications do require in all Presbyters an ability to rule the Church, and do suppose them to be rulers of the Church; as is clear, *1 Tim.* 3.4, 5. this is not applicable to Episcopacy, for in Episcopacy it is not needful that Presbyters be able to rule, seeing they have no exercise of that Faculty: as God createth nothing in vain, so he doth not require any qualifications of men in vain. Is it imaginable that if a man be well qualified to Preach, &c. and yet unfit to rule; that the Lord would have that man kept out of the Ministry for that want of a ruling ability, seeing he should have no use of that faculty if he had it? *Ergo*, these qualifications are not applicable to Episcopacy, where the Bishop alone rules. If it be said, that this maketh the sole Jurisdiction of Bishops unlawful, not their being Rulers together with the Presbyters; *Ans.* If Bishops be set over Presbyters, they must either be only *Præsides*, which is contrary to Parity (for we speak of Parity or Imparity of Jurisdiction) or they must have Authority above and over their Brethren; and if so they may rule without their Brethren; seeing they may command them and make that power void which Christ hath given his Servants; and so the force of what I have said doth

return

return. Again, if Presbyters under a Bishop have Ruling Power, either they may determine without, or against his consent, or not; if so, the Bishop is but a President; if not, the Presbyters are but Cyphers, seeing the Bishop may do in the Church what he pleaseth.

Sett. 12. He cometh p. 184. to the Laws concerning a right managing of their work, which I do not deny to be applicable to either form; and no wonder, for faithfulness is a commanded duty in what ever station God putteth a man: But our Author taketh occasion here to infer the indifferency of either form. 1. Because *Paul* did not determine in his Epistles to *Tim.* and *Tit.* (which chiefly concern Church-Government) whether any could succeed to *Timothy* and *Tit.* in *Ephesus* and *Creet.* Ans. It is a bad consequence, for the thing did determine itself, for they were Extraordinary Officers, immediately called by God, being Evangelists; therefore they were to have no Successors, unless the Lord did so call them. Further, they were not fixed in these places, but for a time: they did not live and die there; which shewed that there was no need of Successors to them in that Office. Again he argueth, that the Apostle did not determine how the Pastors of several Churches should order things of common concernment; which, considered with the former, would seem a strange omission, were either of these forms necessary. Ans. This is no strange omission, nor should it so be esteemed by this Author, who taketh all that is requisite for the right managing of Affairs by the Pastors of several Churches, to be of the Law of Nature, viz. that they should meet, that one should moderate, that there should be Appeals, &c. as I observed out of him before. 2. We deny that it is omitted: yea, this Author in saying otherwise, contradicteth himself; for he will not deny, but there are directions in these Epistles for Church-Government; and he affirmeth, that they are applicable to either form, Ergo, to Pastors acting in Parity; neither was it needful that there

F

should

should be directions to them, which are not applicable to Bishops governing, because the managing of the work is the same in both ways, except what Nature maketh necessary to a Society, or a single person governing, which also it doth teach. 3. The matter is determined even in these Epistles, viz. 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. where it is obscurely held forth, that *Tim.* was ordained by a Presbytery; which inferreth, that Presbyters ought so to be ordained, and not by a Bishop alone. 4. Though the matter were not determined in these Epistles, it is no wonder, they being written to particular men, but it is determined in other Scriptures, viz. where Christ gives the Keys, not to one, but to all the Apostles then, the only Church Officers; and where *Paul* committeth the care of the Church of *Ephesus*, not to one Bishop, but to the Elders in common, *Act.* 20. 28. Of this he saith *p.* 184. it is equally a duty, whether we understand the Overseers some acting over others, or all joyning in equality. But by his leave, when the Apostle giveth the charge peremptorily to all the Elders of *Ephesus* (for so they he speaketh, not to these of other Churches of *Asia*, as he dreameth the Text may be understood, upon what ground I know not) there is no doubt left, whether he maketh it the duty of them all in common, or of some one set over the rest: And may we not think that this Command is a standing Rule, reaching even to us, as he himself saith, (*p.* 185.) of what is contained in the Epistles to *Tim.* and *Tit.*? and if so, then all Pastors are Bishops or Overseers, not one over the rest, by Apostolick Authority. He argueth thus, *p.* 185. *Tim.* is charged to commit the things he had heard of *Paul* to faithful men, who might be able also to teach others. *2 Tim.* 2. 2. Had it not been as requisite to have charged him to have committed his power of Government to them, &c.? *Ans.* 1. Yea, he doth here commit power of Preaching, and of governing, jointly to *Timothy*, to be transferred by him to others; for of both these, I

pose, *Tim.* had heard from *Paul*: why then must we here understand the one, rather than the other? in that he mentioneth Teaching, not Ruling, it is because Teaching is the main business, and hath the other power necessarily joined with it, by divine Institution. 2. It is not always needful to mention Governing Power, where ever the power of a Minister is mentioned, and here, it cannot be deemed needful, because the Apostle had formerly instructed *Tim.* that he choose none to be Pastors, but they who are able to Rule too, whence it followeth, that when he biddeth him commit to them the Pastoral charge, he intendeth Ruling Power as a part of it; else to what purpose should he require ability to Rule in them? To the same purpose is what he saith of *Tit.* 'That he bid him ordain Elders, but told not what Power did belong to them; a Negative Argument from one place of Scripture, is in conclusion, such as this is: From the Superiority of *Tim.* and *Tit.* '(I pass his clearing of it, from being an Argument for Episcopacy) he inferreth two things, p. 186. 187. First that the Superiority of some Church Officers (he should have said Presbyters, for of Officers it is not Questioned on either hand) over others, is not contrary to the Rule of the Gospel. 2. That it is not repugnant to the Constitution of the Church in Apostolical times for men to have power over more then one particular Congregation. These saith he follow, though their Office be supposed extraordinary; and that they acted as Evangelists. *Ans.* It will follow indeed from these examples, that Superiority is not contrary to Nature, nor to the Nature of a Gospel Church: Also it will follow, that it is not contrary to Gospel Institution, that the Lord should immediately, when he seeth cause, appoint such Superiority; and what if we say it followeth, that it is not contrary to Gospel Institution, that in some extraordinary cases, that Superiority may be allowed for time. But none of these are the thing in Question:

for this doth not follow, that because the Lord did immediately call these men, and gave them Extraordinary Power over others; therefore he hath not instituted, that the ordinary way of Church Government shall be by Pastors acting in Purity, which is here disputed. His third head of Laws, formerly mentioned, he toucheth, p. 188. and bringeth instances of some General rules for Church Government, which I confess are not peculiar to one form: But this doth not hinder that there may be other Rules which are such; which himself instanceth; as, that complaints be made to the Church: it is an odd exposition to say, *i.e.* Tell the Bishop. The Church implieth clearly a Plurality. p. 187. 'had it been the will of Christ, saith he, that there should be no Superiority of Pastors, there would have been some exprets and direct prohibition of it. *Ans.* Might not a prohibition by Consequence serve turn? This is very peremptorily spoken. 2. What needeth any prohibition, when Christ had instituted a way inconsistent with it; this was a prohibition of it: now this he did by giving Ruling power to all Presbyters, and hath been already shewed.

Sect. 13. He bringeth another Argument of his Opposites, p. 189. *Viz.* 'That it is of equal necessity, that Christ should Institute a certain Form, as that any other Legislator that moderates a Commonwealth should do. His first. *Ans.* To this is, that Christ hath instituted such an immutable Government in his Church as is sufficient for the succession and continuance of it; which is all that founders of Republicks looked after, and 'That there be such an order and distinction of Persons, and subordination, that a Society may be preserved among them. Till then it be proved that no form is necessary for the being of a Church, this Argument can prove nothing. Reply, it is false, that Legislators looked after no more but that, we find none of them, who settled not a particular Form: yea

was necessary; for these Generals could not be practised, but in some particular Form, this or that: and of these we find they choosed what they thought fittest: even so Christ not only appointed Generals, but knowing a particular Form is only practicable, he chose that which he thought fittest; mans choise in this is alterable, because other men may have as much wisdom and authority as they; Christs choise is not so, for the contrary reasons. His second *Ans. p. 190.* 'Is, what is not absolutely necessary to the being of a Church, is in Christs liberty, whether he will determine it or not: even as when I hear, that *Lycurgus* and others did form a Republick; I conclude there must be Government: But not that they Institute Monarchy, &c. this must be known by taking a view of their Laws. Reply, we acknowledge that Form of Government to be in Christs liberty whether he will determine it, or not; but we think it like, that he hath determined it: as for other reasons, so because even men have not appointed the Generals of Government, without a form in which they should subsist: much less would the wise God do so; if they being wiser then others, did think it fitter to choose the Form then to leave it at other mens will, much more would he. What he saith, of inferring, that they did appoint this or that Form, from their modelling a Common Wealth; is not to the purpose: for that they did appoint a Form we know by History; and, I suppose, that every one thinketh that they did wisely in so doing; and that their doing so was for the good of the Republick: hence we infer that it is like Christ did so, seeing he sought his peoples good more then they; and the Church is less able to choose for her self, then those Republicks were; seeing Church Matters are of spiritual concernment, and so lie further out of the Road of mens Wit then the affairs of State do. I yield to him that we could not know, what Form Christ hath instituted, but by looking into his Laws;

yea, and but that way, we could not certainly know that he hath determined any one form; yet this doth not hinder, but such Arguments as this may have their own weight. The Testimony he bringeth out of *Mr. Hooker*, is answered from what hath been said, and I am to meet with it elsewhere: He mistaketh our intent in such Arguments, and falsly supposeth that the form we plead for is not found in the Bible.

Secl. 14. He bringeth another argument, *p. 191.* from the similitude of a Vine which must have its Dressers; and a House, and a City, which must have Government: it was very easie for him to answer the Argument thus propounded; I know not who ever did so manage it: But it might have been thus improved, a wise Master of a Vineyard will not let his servants do what they please, but will appoint them his work in his Vineyard; and a Master of a Family, or a King in a Country or City, will not let the Servants or Subjects chuse in what they shall be governed; *Ex. 20.* if the Church be a Vine, a House, a City, and Christ be the Head and Ruler of it, it is not like that he hath left the choise of the way of governing it to men, but hath appointed it himself: If he had thus propounded the Argument, it had not been so easily answered. The same way he useth the next Argument, *p. 192.* taken from the difference of Civil and Ecclesiastical Government; the one of which is called the Ordinance of man, and the other is Gods Ordinance: therefore though that be mutable, this is not. I chuse rather to frame the Argument otherwise, out of his own Concession he maketh difference between these two Governments, the one is for a Political, the other for a spiritual end; the one for a temporal, the other for an eternal end; the one given to men as men, the other to men as Christians; the one to preserve Civil Right, the other to preserve an Eternal Interest, &c. Then, however the Lord let men chuse the way of at-
tain-

aining political and temporal ends, and provide for their own standing as men, and preserve their Civil rights; yet it is strange to think, that he hath left it to mens choise to take this or that way for attaining their spiritual and eternal end, for procuring their standing as Christians, for preserving their spiritual rights: though the one be the Ordinance of man, sure the other must be the Ordinance of God: But the form of Church-Government is the way to attain these, because Church-Government is the mean, as is confessed, and it cannot be acted but in a particular form, and the form is the way of managing that mean, and so attaining the end; yea, it is such a way as hath exceeding influence upon attaining these ends, seeing a wrong form may more hinder than promote them; man, I suppose, may chuse a way that may do more hurt than good; it is strange then if Christ hath left this which is of such high concernment, to such high ends, to the will of corrupt men: and this Argument may have the more weight *ad hominem*, because this Author is often endeavouring to shape Church-Government according to the Civil, which is very unsuitable to what he asserteth of their differences.

Sett. 15. Another argument *p. 194.* is, if the form of Church-Government be not in Scripture determined immutably, then it is in the power of the Church to make new Officers which Christ never made. To this he answereth: 1. These Officers are only said to be new which were never appointed by Christ, and are contrary to the first appointment of Christ, but one set over many Pastors is not such; for besides the general practice from the first Primitive times, Christ himself laid the foundation of such an Office, in appointing Apostles. *Reply.* Here are many things huddled together, to excuse Episcopacy from Novelty, which we must examine severally. 1. They are not a new Office, would he say, because Christ instituted such

an Office, *viz.* Apostles. Reply. I hope he will not say, that the Office of an Apostle, and of a *Diocesan* Bishop, is the same Office; for the Apostles had much power, which Bishops have not, and were Extraordinary Officers, immediately called by God, so are not Bishops: and however there may be some resemblance between them, yet if they be not the same Office, it must be a new Office from what Christ appointed. It is not the want of Similitude, but the want of Identity, with what hath been before, that maketh a thing new; neither need we enter the dispute with him, what way extraordinary, and what not, in the Apostolick Office, nor doth the Question lie in that, as he alledgeth; for we maintain (and I think it will not be deny'd by him) that the Office in *complexo*, *viz.* as it did subsist in *rerum naturâ*, was extraordinary, and is ceased; and therefore whatever Office is made up of some part of the power they had, without the rest of it, must be a different Office from that, and so new. Indeed if Christ had given them their power by halves, and made the one half of it common to some Officer appointed by him to continue in the Church, *viz.* power over Presbyters, and the other half of it peculiar to them, then Bishops having power over Presbyters, though they had been a new Office from the Apostles, and not the same, yet should they have had the same Office with these others that we supposed, and so had not been new simply; but there being no such thing, they must be in another Office than Christ ever appointed, and so simply new. Wherefore it is an unreasonable demand of the Author, *p.* 195. that we must prove power over Presbyters to be extraordinary, before we say it must cease: For it is enough that the whole Office be extraordinary, that it be not a pattern for any other Office that should be the same: Yea, we can easily prove that that power, as in the Apostles, and making up the Complex

their Office, was extraordinary, because it cannot
 survive the Office it self under that notion; and we
 can also prove, that Christ never instituted any such
 power by it self, and without the other parts of the
 Apostolick Office: whence it clearly followeth, that
 such a power by it self (which is a clear description
 of the Episcopal Office) is divers from all the Offices
 instituted by Christ, and so is a new Office: What he
 saith of the ceasing of this power with the Apostles,
 as to its necessity, but not as to its lawfulness, is most
 impertinent, and a begging of the Question; for the
 conclusion of the Argument is, that it is unlawful, be-
 cause it hath no institution, that institution which it
 had in the Apostles being ceased. His confirmation of
 this his distinction containeth a manifest fallshood, *viz.*
 to make a thing unlawful, saith he, which was before
 lawful, there must be an expresse prohibition forbid-
 ding the use of such a thing: This, I say, applied to
 the matter in hand, is most false, for we speak of
 things which have their lawfulness only from institu-
 tion, *viz.* Authority given to one over others: now
 that which is thus lawful, becometh unlawful, meerly
 by the withdrawing of the Institution, though no ex-
 press prohibition of it be made. As is evident from
 the like case among men, when a King giveth a Com-
 mission to a Judge, it is lawful for him to act in that
 capacity: now if the King shall call in his Commis-
 sion, though there be no expresse forbidding of the
 man, I suppose it is now become unlawful for him to
 act. Just so is our case; one Pastor can have no au-
 thority over another, unless it be given him by Christ,
 who ascended up on high, and received these gifts for
 men, *Eph. 4.* Now Christ had given once such a pow-
 er to men, *viz.* the Apostles, this he hath now with-
 drawn, by not giving such Commission to any others,
 but the Apostles; for I suppose (to follow the former
 example) that when a Judge which had a Commission
 dieth,

dieth, it is a sufficient withdrawing of his Commission, that the King doth not give it to any other who may succeed him: wherefore any who take that power to them, do it without Commission from Christ which is unlawful.

Sect. 16. Another Answer he bringeth to this argument, *p. 195.* on which he insisteth much, as a foundation tending to establish his whole Cause, but I hope it shall prove a ruinous foundation. The Answer is this; 'The extending of any Ministerial power, is not the appointing of any new, but a determining the extent of that in *actu secundo*, which every Minister hath in *actu primo*. For clearing this, he undertaketh two things. 1. To shew that the power of every Minister doth primarily and habitually respect the Church in common, which I do freely yield to him. 2. *P. 197.* That the Officers of the Church may in a peculiar manner attribute a larger and more extensive power to some particular persons, for the more convenient exercise of their common power. Before I come to examine what he saith to this purpose, let me note: 1. That he speaketh here in a new strain, before he had attributed this power of determining to the Magistrate, now the Officers of the Church must have it, which I confess is more fit: But he soon repenteth, and in the end of the same page maketh it lye between the Pastors and Magistrate, whether he please. It is strange to see how those who loose hold of the truth, hang as Meeteors, and know not where to fix. I take notice, 2. That whereas the former part of his undertaking (which he knew to be out of controversie among them against whom he disputeth) he establisheth by five strong Arguments; but for that part where the stress of the matter lieth, he hath not brought so much as one reason to evince what he saith, but some few bare Assertions for the clearing of it; and indeed it

sometimes easier to prove the thing that is not, than
 thing that is denied, even to such able men
 Mr. Stillingfl. But let us now attend to what
 faith for his Opinion: *We have seen*, saith he,
their power extendeth to the care of the Churches in
mon; that the restraint of this power is a matter of or-
and decency in the Church. Here are two things, the
 of which we have heard, and seen solidly pro-
 ; but the latter I have not yet seen, where he hath
 any thing but asserted it, as he here doth: but
 it being a matter of such concernment and con-
 versie, needed some more proof; wherefore I can-
 not pass it so slightly as he hath done. We may di-
 stinguish a twofold restraining (the same holdeth in
 enlarging) of the exercise of the power of Church-
 Officers, viz. in respect of the Object of it, and in
 respect of the acts of it. Restraint, in respect of the
 object of this power, may be subdivided: First, when
 that power is permitted or appointed to be exercised
 over more or fewer objects of the same kind, which
 it doth respect by the appointment of Christ; as that
 a Minister should have a narrower or larger bounds
 for his Parish, or more or fewer people to watch over;
 and so of the limiting of Presbyteries, Synods, &c.
 This restraint, or enlargement of power in its exer-
 cise, we acknowledge to be a matter of order and de-
 cency, and may be determined by the prudence of the
 Church. Secondly, when it is extended to the objects
 of another kind, or restricted from the whole Species
 of these objects that Christ hath appointed it for; as
 when a Bishop by himself, who by Christs Institution
 hath only power over the people, getteth power, given
 him by man, over his fellow Pastors; and when a
 Presbyter, who by Christs Institution hath a power
 over the Flock to rule them, is hindred from the ex-
 ercise of this power altogether, and is set only to
 feed, and this ruling power, as to its exercise, is whol-
 ly

ly devolved upon another : This we deny to be a matter of order and decency committed to the Church's prudence. Restraint and enlargement, in respect of acts of power, is when some acts which may be by Christs Institution exercised by all Presbyters, are only permitted to be exercised by some, and not by others; as Ordination, Church-censures : and where some are authorized to do some acts of power that Christs Institution giveth them no Commission unto this, together with that restraint mentioned in the second member of the subdivision, we prove, not to be matters of order, left to the prudence of the Church, but to be the setting up of a new Office in the Church. 1. Order that the Church is commanded to look after, requireth the right circumstantiating of these acts which Christ hath appointed to be done in his Church; as that they be done in fit time, place, method, &c. neither can this ordering of things reach beyond the determination of circumstances, for whatever is more than this, is not an ordering of that action unto which the circumstances do belong, but an instituting of a new action; because (for example) the right order of reading doth not require prayer, or singing to be joyned with it, but respecteth only the circumstances of reading it self : now, such restraining or enlarging of the exercise of power, is no right circumstantiating of it, but some other thing; it being no circumstance of the exercise of Pastoral power, whether he shall rule or not, but an essential part (I mean as to the integrality, it being an integral part) of that power which Christ hath given him, as is confessed : also, giving the exercise of that power to one which belongeth to many, is not adding of a circumstance, but a supernumerary part of power (as to its exercise) above these parts that Christ hath given them; *ergo*, this is no ordering of the exercise of power, but setting up of it anew. 2. Order that be-
longeth

togeth to the prudence of the Church, is that unto
 which confusion is opposite; then is that order ob-
 served, when all confusion is avoided; but confusion
 may be avoided, without this restraining and enlarg-
 ing of Church-power by men, else it were in no case
 lawful to let power be exercised as it is instituted by
 Christ, because we must always be careful to avoid
 confusion; *ergo*, I confesse restraining of the exercise of
 power, as to objects of the same kind, as fixing of Pa-
 rishes, is necessary to avoid confusion: but this can-
 not be said of taking power of ruling out of the
 hands of Presbyters, and giving it to Bishops; else we
 must say that Episcopacy is necessary, which destroyeth
 this mans Hypothesis. If it be said that sometimes
 it falleth out that this is necessary to avoid confusion,
 and then Episcopacy is necessary. *Ans.* If we should
 grant that it is sometimes useful to avoid confusion,
 as that which may be the fruit of Parity, yet it can-
 not be said that Parity it self is confusion: now, it
 is not in the Churches power to take her own way, to
 avoid whatever may have a bad effect (for the best
 things may be such) but she must shun that which is
 evil by a right managing, not by laying aside that
 which is good: wherefore seeing Order is consistent
 with Parity, and Parity with the Institution of Christ,
 and Imparity goeth at least a step beyond the Institu-
 tion, and taketh that from men which Christ gave
 them, and giveth it to some to whom he gave it not,
 this cannot be a right ordering of his Institution, but
 rather setting up some other thing in the place there-
 of. 3. The right ordering of the exercise of that
 power which Christ hath given to men, must consist in
 determining of these things which he hath not deter-
 mined, and yet are necessary to be determined, as
 time, place, extent of Parishes, &c. for if men either
 take upon them to determine in these matters, which
 he hath already determined by his Institution, or to deter-

determine things that he hath left at liberty, because the determination was not needful to his design, then, would be wiser then he, and do not order his Institutions, but set up their own. Now this which our Author calleth Ordering is guilty of both these for Christ by giving Ruling Power to all Presbyters hath declared his Will that they shall all Rule, and especially by requiring an ability for this, as a necessary qualification of them, who should be put unto this Office: do not men then, by appointing who should Rule, pass their determination on what he hath already determined, and that contrary to what he hath appointed. Again, Christ hath not appointed any Superiority and Inferiority among Presbyters; neither is it needful this be, the Church may be without it, and yet may take upon them to appoint it. Is this then to order that Government that Christ hath appointed, and not rather to set up new Officers that men have devised.

Señ. 17. Next he subjoyneth a strange assertion. 'Now, saith he, in matters of common concernment, without all question, it is not unlawful, when the Church judgeth it most fit for edification, to grant to some the executive part of that power, which is originally and fundamentally common to them all. *Answer.* If it be so, all this pains that our Author is at, is needless, and his Book to no purpose: For I mistake much if the main business in it be not to prove the lawfulness of this, which here he asserteth to be unquestionably lawful. For he confesseth that ruling power is given by Christ to all Presbyters: then, we must either say that it is his institution that they all exercise it and so parity is his institution: or, that the executive part of it may be given to some, or may be common to them all; and so the form of Government may be left indifferent is the scope of this Book. Now if it be unquestionable, what needeth all this pains about it.

But I conceive, this confident assertion is put instead of
 the Arguments, whereby this undertaking of his should
 have been confirmed: It is an easie thing, when one
 cannot find proofs for their opinion to say, it is out
 of Question, but it is an unhandsome way of disputing,
 especially unbecoming the person, who could not but
 know that this is denied by his Opposites, and is the
 main hinge of the Controversie in hand. We do main-
 tain this Antithesis, that it is the Question between us
 and them who are for the indifferency of Church Go-
 vernment, whether the exercise of Ruling Power may
 be taken out of the hands of Ministers, and given un-
 to one, to be Bishop over them: and we maintain the
 Negative as that which should be out of Question: and
 this we shall not barely assert, as Mr. *Stillingf.* hath done
 his Opinion. I. Then, this taking the exercise of
 that power from men, which Christ hath given them is
 unwarrantable; *ergo*, it is unlawful; I hope, the con-
 sequence will not be denied: for what we lawfully do
 must be some way warranted, either by a Command or
 a Permission. The Antecedent I prove, because a war-
 rant for such a practice cannot be shewed, and further,
 if there were any warrant for it, it must either be from
 Christs command, or 2. From his expresse Permission,
 or 3. From the Law of Nature, or 4. From want of a
 Law forbidding it: But none of these do warrant it,
 not the First nor Second, for our Opposite cannot pro-
 duce such Command or Permission, either directly let
 down or drawn by consequence from it. Nor the
 Third, for then they must produce some dictate of the
 Law of Nature which giveth leave to do this; but
 what that shall be I understand not. Nature indeed
 teacheth, that a Society may use means, for its own
 Peace and Order: but this may be without hindering
 the exercise of that power, the Supreme Governour
 giveth to any of his Officers: there may be this in the
 Church where Presbyters Rule in Common. Nature
 also

also teacheth that when more have a Common power they may consult about the best way of Managing it; but it doth not teach that they may mannage it otherwise then it is committed to them by him who gave it, which they must do if they put it into the hands of one, which is given to more: especially, when it may be managed well without such crossing the Institution of it. Besides all this, Nature can never warrant this alienation of the Power that Christ hath given to his Servants; because Nature doth only warrant us to stand beside Christs Institution (in his matters) where Institution is not sufficient to attain that which is naturally necessary; or when the Acting only by Institution would cross Nature: but there is no natural necessity of giving all power to a Bishop, which Christ hath given to Presbyters: neither doth leaving the exercise of it in common cross Nature: *Ergo* Nature doth not warrant this practice. Neither can the fourth warrant it, for then it should be in the power of man to take all the power that Ministers have from Christ out of their hands and give it to one, so that only the Lord Bishop might preach, baptise, &c. as well as that he only may rule; for there is no Law forbidding the Church, to lay all the parts of Pastoral power on one, more then forbidding to lay one part of it on one. Sure sobriety and due reverence to the Institutions of Christ would teach us to think, that while he hath given equal power to many it should be a sufficient forbidding, that any be so bold as to lay the exercise of that power on one, taking it from the rest.

See 18. 2. I prove it thus. When Christ giveth a power to his Servants to manage the affairs of his Church, it is not only a Licence, whereby they are authorized to do such work, if they think fit, but it is a trust: they get it as a charge that they must give account of, as is evident from the command to this purpose given them, *Act*. 20. 28. take heed to the Flock

over which the Holy Ghost hath made you
 overseers : here is a Command to Overseers to do that
 work, and they must give an account of this their
 charge, *Heb. 13. 17.* Rulers who must be obeyed are
 they who must give an account. Now it is not law-
 ful for one, who getteth such a Trust, to lay it on ano-
 ther: neither may any take it out of his hands to bestow
 upon another without his leave, who gave that trust:
 when Christ hath Commanded Ministers to rule, and will
 take account of them, may they lay their work on a Bi-
 shop? will it be well taken in the day of Account, to say,
 we committed their Flock to another to keep, who
 delivered them to the Wolf, or scattered, and slew them :
 will not the Lord say to them why did not ye feed
 your selves? Sure Christ will require account of
 them to whom he gave the charge, and that is of Pa-
 stors, neither will he ask Account of Bishops, except
 of their Usurpation. *Ergo* it is not lawful, to take the
 exercise of Church Power out of the hands of Mini-
 sters, and give it to a Bishop. 3. Proof. If Presbyters,
 who have received Power from Christ may put the ex-
 ercise of it into the hands of a Bishop alienating it from
 themselves ; why may not Bishops devolve their Pow-
 er on one who shall be over them, and so we shall have
 a Universal Bishop the Pope ; in whom shall rest all
 Church Power, and at whose direction it shall be ex-
 ercised? If that may be done, there is no shadow of
 Reason why this may not be done, for if once the Pow-
 er be taken out of the hand of them to whom Christ
 hath given it, then prudence must be the only Director
 to teach us who must have it: now prudence will as
 well say, that Bishops must have one over them to keep
 them in Order and peace, as that Presbyters must have
 one over them. Neither is there here any inconveni-
 ence that is not there ; for that one may turn to tyrann-
 y as well as the other : and a Bishop cannot oversee
 his charge, without substitutes, more then the Pope
 can

can do : the one may substitute Bishops, Cardinals, &c. as well as the other may substitute Dean, Prebends Archdeacon, &c. Now, I hope, Mr. *Stillington* is not come to that, to think the Papal Office an indifferent Ceremony. *ergo*. neither should he think so of Episcopacy. 4. If Presbyters may devolve the exercise of the power that Christ hath given them into the hands of a Bishop, then they may also give away with their power the very Office that Christ hath given them. But this they may not. *ergo* I prove the Major, for when they devolve the exercise of their ruling power on the Bishop, they not only consent, that he shall rule the people, which they might do : But they make it unlawful for themselves to rule, yea, they give up themselves to be ruled and commanded by him, so that he is their Judge and cannot be judged by them, in case of male-administration (at least this is true *de singulis* if not *de omnibus*) but this is to give away the very power ; for if I may not act, how have I a power to act ; if both I and the people be under the command of another, so that I may not do any thing in reference to the People but by his authority, how have I power to rule ? sure a power is the possibility of the act (*quantum est ex parte cause*) and a moral power is such a lawfulness of the act, but in this case Presbyters want that possibility, or lawfulness of that exercise of Ruling ; and that so, as the defect or hindrance *ex parte cause*, is in themselves who should put forth the acts, *ergo*, they want not only the exercise but the very power of Ruling, which Christ gave them, in such a case. The Minor of the Argument is evident ; for such an alienation were a clear contradicting of Christ : he saith it shall be lawful for you (such a one being lawfully put into the Ministry) to rule : he by this alienating faith, it shall not be lawful for me to rule. If it be said, that Christs gift maketh it lawful for such a

one to rule, but not in all cases ; as suppose the good of the Church requires that this power be taken from him ; his alienating maketh it onely unlawfull in this case, when for the good of the Church, he hath quit his right : so that here there is no opposition ; Christ giveth him a *jus in actu primo*, he alienateth onely this *jus in actu secundo*, as Mr. *Stillington* doth expresse it. *Ans. 1.* However there may be some colour of reason why this may be done in some extraordinary cases ; when Christs institution (which is calculated to ordinary cases, and must ordinarily take place) cannot reach the end of Government : yet to say that it may be done ordinarily, cannot but clash with Christs institution : for when Christ giveth ruling power to Presbyters, though we may think that it is not his will, that they must needs exercise it in all cases, yet must we think that he intendeth they should exercise it ordinarily : for why giveth he them power, which they as readily never as ever act, and that as men please to determine ? we must not think that it is the intent of Christs Commission to his Servants, that men may without the force of necessity bid on by an extraordinary Providence (and then God doth it and not men) hinder the acts of it as they will. 2. It is supposed without ground that the good of the Church can ordinarily require the retaining power given by Christ ; for if we speak of that is ordinarily good for the Church, how can we better discern that than by looking into Christs institution ? wherefore, seeing by this equal power, at least *actu primo* is given to Presbytery ; we are to think, that the exercise of this power is best for the Church ; though ambitious men, and they who would flatter the Magistrate, think otherwise ; yea though the best men should dissent, sure Christs giving such a power saith more for the goodness of the exercise of it than mens opinions, though seeming to have a foundation

dation on some inconveniencies of it can say against it : especially considering, what ever way beside, men devise, is attended with as great, if not greater inconveniencies of another nature. 3. I have already made it appear, that this alienation of power given by Christ doth not only reach the *actus secundus* of it, but even the *actus primus* ; seeing a man is not in capacity to recal his deed, and reassume the exercise of his power, though it were improved never so much against the end of Christs giving, and his alienating of it.

Sect. 19. 5. Proof (which is directly against enlarging the exercise of Church Power in the hands of any beyond what Christ hath given them) if the exercise of that power, which Christ hath given to all, may be taken from the rest and given to one, then that one getteth a power both in *actu primo* & in *secundo*, which he had not from Christ, but this is unlawful, *ergo* The Major I prove : for it is clear he getteth power in *actu secundo*, which he had not from Christ, *ergo* he getteth such power in *actu primo*, seeing *actus secundus* cannot be without *primus*, nor lawful exercise of power without the *ius* or power it self. If it be said, that Christ giveth only the *actus primus*, and that so as it extendeth to the whole Church : and therefore no *actus secundus* of power can be given to one, which doth extend further than this.

Ans. 1. It is true, he giveth formally only the *actus primus*, but the *actus secundus* doth result from it, and therefore he giveth both. 2. It is true, the power that Christ giveth doth extend to the whole Church, but this must be understood with a twofold distinction.

Dist. 1. Disjunctive it is true, that is, every Minister hath a power to rule whatever part of the Church, this or that, or another ; so that no part of it is without his Commission, as that he should go beyond his bounds in being set over it. Conjunctive, it is false, that is, Christ hath not given so much of the *actus primus* of power

power to rule all, or many Congregations. *Dist. 2.* When Christ giveth the *actus primus* of power to a Minister, extending to the whole Church; it is to be understood in adequate, *i. e.* that he hath a share in that power so extended; and may in conjunction with other rule the whole Church: not adequate, *i. e.* Christ hath not given to any such a power, as that he by himself or with a few, excluding the rest, who are also in the Commission, rule the whole Church. So that when ever any one exerciseth authority by himself, or excluding others, who have the same power granted by Christ, over more than his particular Congregation, over which he may have personal inspection; he taketh a power in *actu secundo*, where Christ hath given him no *ius*, nor *actus primus* of power. The Minor of the argument is manifest; for when both power and exercise of it is given to a man, which Christ hath not given; this is setting up a new Office, which Christ hath not set up: for what is an Office in the Church, but a power and a lawful exercise of it? but this our Author confesseth to be unlawful, *ergo* 6. Proof. 'Tis presumption even among men for a servant to commit that work to another to do; which his Master hath given him to do, except he know, that he hath his Masters leave so to do: this is so well known, that I need not insist on it, *ergo* it is much presumption, when Christ hath committed the ruling of his house to every Minister, that some should devolve that work on a Bishop to do it for them, unless they could shew Christs warrant for this, which if Mr. *Stillingfleet* or any other will do, we shall acquiesce. If there be any disparity in this comparison, I am sure it will tend to the strengthening, not the weakening of our argument, for we are more absolutely under Christs command, than Servants are under their Masters; his commands are more perfect and effectual to compass their end, without our taking our own way in managing

naging obedience to them, then mens are: also, the there is a greater tie to cleave scrupulously to his injunctions than to mens: also the matters about which they are, be of more weight, and miscarriage in them more dangerous, then mens commands. All which make it more absurd to commit the exercise of our power, that he giveth to others, than for Servants to do so with their Masters work.

Señ. 20. For better understanding of what he had said, our Author subjoyneth a distinction of a twofold power belonging to Church Officers, viz. a Power of Order in preaching the word, visiting the sick, administering the Sacraments, &c. this he maketh to be inseparably joyned to the function; and to belong to every ones personal capacity, both in *actu primo*, and *actu secundo*, and a power of Jurisdiction, in visiting Churches, overseeing particular Pastors, Ordination, Church Censures, making Rules for decency: this he maketh to be in every Presbyter *quoad aptitudinem* and habitually, so as he hath a *jus* to it in *actu primo*; but the exercise and limitation of it, and some further power of choise and delegation to it, and some further Authority besides the power of Order. And when this power, either by consent of the Pastors of the Church, or by the appointment of the Christian Magistrate, or both, is devolved to some particular persons; though *quoad aptitudinem*, the power remain in every Presbyter; yet *quoad executionem*, it belongs to them who are so appointed. To this, I reprove a few things briefly. 1. I take notice here of a contradiction in *terminis*, to what he taught, *Part. 1. c. 2. p. 41.* and we refuted *p.* there he made the power of Order peculiar to Ministers and power of Jurisdiction peculiar to the Magistrate, describing both powers no otherwise then he doth here, and yet here he giveth the power of Jurisdiction as well as of Order to Ministers. 2. Seeing he acknowledgeth both powers

quoad jus to be equally given by Christ to all Ministers; it is strange that he should deny that men may restrain the one (for he confesseth the *actus secundus* of it to be inseparably joined to the Office) and yet doth boldly affirm that they may restrain the other; without giving the least shew of permission that they have from Christ who gave both powers, so to tamper with the one more then with the other. If Christ hath made no difference between these (and if he hath it should have been produced) how dare men do it? I confess, Nature maketh a necessity of restricting the power of Jurisdiction: for if every one should Rule, when and where he pleased, there would be confusion; and therefore it is needful that every one have their own charge which they exercise this power over: but this is common to the power of Order also (though with some difference) for it is not fit that every Minister should preach and baptize where and when he pleaseth, without any limitation. Neither could this be without confusion. Also Christ hath made a limitation of the exercise of the power of Jurisdiction; for by giving it to many, and making it relate to things of common concernment, he hath, *eo ipso*, determined, that none of these who have it, shall exercise it by himself nor without the concurrence and consent of them, who are equal in Commission with him. This limitation of the exercise we confess to be warrantable: but what reason there is, I cannot understand, why men should take away the exercise of ruling power from many, and give it to one, more than they can take away the exercise of preaching power, and so give it to some, as it shall not be lawful for them to preach, but only to rule, more than they can take away the exercise of both powers, seeing Christ hath equally given them. Sure it is an impregnable Argument that our Author here furnisheth us with against himself; men

may not restrain the exercise of the power of order, further than Nature maketh it necessary; *Ergo*, they may not any further restrain the exercise of the power of Jurisdiction, because Christ hath not made such a difference in his giving these powers to men. If it be said, that the restraint of the power of Jurisdiction is sometimes necessary, because Parity breeds Factions, and many are unfit to rule. *Ans.* Even so, letting all preach, doth often breed Heresie, many preach false Doctrine, and many are unfit to preach. So this argument must either plead for the restraint of both powers, or of neither. Let us then see what must be the remedy of this abuse of the power of order, and the remedy of the abuse of the other must be proportionable: sure the remedy is not to restrain the exercise of the power of preaching (except it be for a time, in expectation of their amendment, which holdeth also with reference to ruling power) but to put such unfit men out of the Ministry. Were it fit to lay the work of an Heretical Preacher upon a Curate, and let him still have the charge of the Flock, though his Curate doth the work for him? No, but he should be removed, and another put in his place: Even so, they who are unfit to rule, must not have a Bishop do it for them, but be removed, that other fit men may be put in their place; seeing ruling abilities are a necessary qualification of a Minister, as well as preaching abilities, as was shewed before. If Parity breed Factions, we must censure the guilty, not cross Christs Institutions in the exercise of that power he hath given.

Scilicet. 21. 3. It is not good sense that he saith, (speaking of the power of Jurisdiction) that though it belong habitually, and in *actu primo* to all, yet in a constituted Church, some further Authority is necessary, besides the power of order. Whether this be the Printers fault, or the Authors, I know not: but sure, the

the power of order is no part of that Authority by which the power of Jurisdiction is exercised. 4. He leaveth us in suspence about the power of restraining the exercise of the power of Jurisdiction; for he implieth, that it may be done by the consent of the Pastors, or by the appointment of the Magistrate, or both. If this power that Christ hath given his Servants may be taken from them in its exercise, it is very fit we should know to whom the Lord hath given leave to do this. I believe, and have proved that no man may do it; but if it may be done, sure it is not thus left at randome, that it should be *primi occupantis*: Pastors themselves cannot do it, for they have got the charge; and they, not the Bishop whom they entrust, must give an account: The Magistrate may not do it, for he is no ruler of the Church; but this is the highest act of ruling the Church, and of ruling and disposing of the Rulers of it as he pleaseth; and if neither may do it, both may not do it, seeing the reasons brought exclude both from any measure of power in that thing. I do not stand on the Authority of *Camero* (which is all the proof he hath for his opinion) cited p. 198. viz. *Ordinatio non fit à Pastore quatenus Pastor est, sed quatenus ad tempus singulare auctoritatem obtinet*: Neither shall I strive to strain it to a sound sence; but be satisfied with the truth, that we have upon better grounds than *Camero's* Authority established, viz. that Ordination, and other acts of Church-power, are done by Pastors, not by virtue of any superadded power, or Delegation that they have from men, above what Christ hath given them in their Pastoral Office, but by vertue of that power he hath given to all Pastors, though the conveniency of exercising it, *hic & nunc*, requires the concurring of some more circumstances: *Ergo*, that other Pastors poyne in Ordination; that it be not without the limits which are fixed (for order) for the inspection of that

that Society of Pastors, whereof such an one is a Member, or if it be without these limits, that it be not without a special Call from them, who should there exercise their Authority. The Conclusion of our Author needeth small Animadversion, supposing what hath been already said: By this, saith he, we may already understand how lawful the exercise of an Episcopal power may be in the Church of God (yea, by what we have said may be seen how unlawful it is) supposing the equality of the power of order: (But we must also suppose (and it hath been yielded) the equality of the power of Jurisdiction, at least in *actu primo*; and that may shew us the unlawfulness of Episcopacy.) And how incongruously they speak, who supposing an equality in the Presbyters of the Church at first, do cry out that the Church takes upon her the Office of Christ, if she delegates any to a more peculiar exercise of the power of Jurisdiction: Yea, we have made it appear, that they speak most congruously to the thing; for it is Christs Office to give the exercise of power to such men, by giving them the Office on which it followeth; and therefore they who take it from them, and give it to them to whom he gave it not, do take his Office. But it is a mincing of the matter, to talk of a more peculiar exercise of the power of Jurisdiction; when indeed, setting up of a Bishop, is a laying others aside from the exercise of it at all, and suffering them to do nothing that way, but by his Authority: yea, that which we have all this while disputed against, is yet less intollerable than is our case, where Bishops have most absolute and Lordly powers, and delegate it to whom they will, Lay-men or others, and Presbyters have no power at all.

Seet. 22. Another Argument he propoundeth, *p. 198.* from the perfection of Scripture, from which it doth much derogate, to say, that in it Christ hath

not

not laid down an immutable form of Church-Government. This Argument he almost tuffeth at ; but that is easier than to answer it solidly : Unto it he bringeth three Answers , all which will not make up a satisfactory one. The first is the perfection of the Scripture here meant, is in reference to its end (this I grant) which is to be an adequate Rule of Faith and manners , and sufficient to bring men to Salvation ; which is sufficiently acknowledged to be, all things necessary to be believed or practised, be contained in the Word of God : Now that which we assert, not to be fully laid down in Scripture, is not pleaded to be any ways necessary, nor to be a matter of Faith, but something left to the Churches liberty. Reply. I perceive it to be ordinary with this Author (I observed it before) to slight with confidence that which he hath little to say against in reason. What a pittiful come off is this ? that the not determining the form of Government is not against the perfection of the Scripture, because it is not a thing necessary, but left to the Churches liberty : What it is to beg the question, if this be not, I know not ; for the question is, whether the form be determined in Scripture, or left to the Churches liberty : the latter he maintaineth , we assert the former, and prove it , because otherwise the Scripture were imperfect : He answereth , it doth not follow that the Scripture is imperfect, because the form of Government is left to the Churches liberty. Is this the easie dispatch of this Argument which was promised ? 2. If the end of Scripture be to be an adequate Rule of Faith and manners ; then sure, in a special way, of Religious manners or practises, among which is the way of managing Church-Government, being a Religious thing ; for we speak of Government as it is peculiar to the Church : hence then it must belong to its perfection to lay down this, especially

cially seeing the Scripture hath told us, that this is one of its particular ends, to direct the Pastors of the Church how to behave themselves in the House of God, 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. but this it cannot do completely, without setting down a form of Government, for general Rules will not tell a Pastor whether he shall exercise his ruling power with others, or lay it over on my Lord Bishop; *Ergo*, the want of this form in Scripture doth derogate from that perfection which our Author confesseth to be in it. 3. By things necessary, I hope he doth not mean only necessary to salvation, but necessary to these particular ends propounded in the Scripture, one of which is the right managing of Church-Government. Now if all things necessary to this be laid down in Scripture, there cannot want a form of Government in it, for without that Government cannot be managed. His second answer is, that the doing of a thing not contained in Scripture, with an opinion of its necessity, doth destroy the Scriptures perfection; and so in that sense every *additio perficiens* is *corrumpens*; such are the Popish Traditions; but the doing of a thing without the opinion of its necessity doth not destroy it. *Reply.* This is a poorer shift than the other: For 1. It is not the adding of a form of Government to what is in Scripture that we make unlawful, or against the Scriptures sufficiency; for sure if it be not in Scripture, it must be added, seeing Nature maketh it necessary: but it is the opinion of its not being in Scripture that we plead against; and therefore this Answer doth not at all touch the Argument, neither is the example of Popish Traditions to the purpose; for we do not say that they are against Scripture perfection, because they are held not to be found in it, (for that is most true) but because they are thought needful to be added to it. 2. It is against the perfection of Scripture to say any addition to it is necessary for attaining

taining its end; whether that particular thing added
 to it be necessary, or its defect may be as well sup-
 plied by another thing of that kind; as if any should
 maintain that we must have more Sacraments than are
 in Scripture, and should not think this in particular
 necessary, but leave it to the Churches liberty, what
 particular Sacrament should be superadded: But Ma-
 ster *Stillingfleet*'s Opinion maketh an addition necessa-
 ry, *viz.* that there be a form of Government which
 is not in Scripture, though it leave the particular form
 to the Churches liberty; *Ergo*, it is against the per-
 fection of Scripture; and this addition being of a
 thing in its general nature necessary to an end that
 the Scripture aimeth at, *viz.* the right governing of
 the Church, and not being found in Scripture, so
 much as that men may determine it, it is such an
additio perficiens as the Author confesseth to be *cor-*
umpens. 3. By this Answer, none of the Popish Tra-
 ditions are additions to the Scripture, or imply its
 imperfection; for though they be held necessary in
 the general, yet in particular they cannot so be held;
 for either they were freely determined by the Church,
 and so they might not have been, and therefore are
 not necessary, or the Church was necessitated to de-
 termine them by some antecedent objective truth in
 the things: if so, they must be the Dictates of Na-
 ture, which are no additions to Scripture; wherefore
 this Answer destroyeth it self. 4. At least, by this
 Answer, all the Popish and Prelatical Ceremonies,
 and whatsoever superstitious men can devise to bring
 into the worship of God, is no addition to the Scrip-
 ture, nor a blot upon its perfection; for these are not
 held for necessary things, but indifferent, and only ne-
 cessary when commanded by Authority; which ne-
 cessity, I suppose, Mr. *Stilling.* will plead for to his
 form of Government. Now this Consequence I hope
 he will not own; wherefore he may be ashamed to
 own

own that from which it doth so clearly follow. His third Answer is yet of less weight, viz. that the Essentials of Church Government are in Scripture, not the Circumstantials. *Reply.* If he meaneth, as sure he doth, the Essentials of Government in its general and abstract notion, in which it is not practicable without a particular form, he saith nothing to the purpose: The Scripture may be an imperfect rule for Church-Government, though it have these; if he mean the Essentials of a particular form, he destroyeth his own cause. Now we maintain, that to the perfection of Scripture there is required not only a general notion of Government, but so much as is sufficient light to direct the practice of Government: this cannot be without the institution of a particular form, for Government otherwise is not practicable. If it be said, that the general rules in Scripture about Government want nothing requisite for the complete practice of Government, but the determination of circumstances, which cannot belong to Scripture perfection. *Ans.* This we deny (if by general Rules he means, as sure he doth, such as do not determine a particular form) it is some more than a circumstance, whether Pastors exercise that power Christ hath given them, or commit it to a Bishop. I hope it is more than a bare circumstance in Civil Government, whether the power be in the hand of one, or a few, or all the people, even so 'tis here: yea, herein lieth the very Essence of a form of Government; if this then be not found in Scripture, the Essentials of a form are wanting; but a form is essential to Government, considered as practicable; *Ergo*, some of the Essentials of Government are wanting.

CHAP. V.

Having refuted as he supposed the general Arguments, for a particular Form of Church-Government to have been laid down in Scripture; he cometh now to particular Arguments, which are brought for some one Form, and many he taketh much pains to refute in this Chapter, which I am confident never any did make Use of to prove that he opposeth. We shall let him pass with his supposed victory over these, and only take notice of what opposeth the Truth we hold, or the Arguments by which it is established. I shall only note, not insist upon his large Hangings, by which in the beginning of this Chapter, heargeth all who are not as Sceptical about Church-Government as himself, with prejudice, and following custome and education, rather than truth, and being loth to quit that opinion, though false, which once they have been engaged in. To which I say nothing, but let every one search his own Conscience, and see what grounds his Perswasion standeth upon. I hope the sincerity of many will be able to bear them out before God, and the solid Reasons they are able to produce will make them stand before men, against such reproaches of this Adversary. Neither shall I retaliate this his charity with the Jealousies of many who fear that they who cast Church-Government thus loose, that the Magistrate may dispose of it at his Pleasure, to fetch the strength of their Arguments, and the life of their perswasion, from no better Topicks then design to please them who can reward this their pains, or to hold fast that which is good (as some have spoken of their satyrenic's) what ever side of the World be uppermost, to which end this opinion is a notable mean. I desire to judge no man, the Lord will ere long judge our opinions and motives too: but this I am sure of, we have no worldly baits to allure us at this time, to plead for the Divine Right of Presbyterian Government, and if the Interest of Christ did not more move us than our own, we might

with much Worldly advantage yield the cause. We do not insist on any of Christs acts towards the *Apostles* in calling them, sending them out either first or last, as Arguments for the Form of Church-Government; knowing that their Office being Extraordinary and Temporal, can be no Rule for the ordinary cases of the Church. Wherefore I pass over all that he writeth in this Chap. till p. 218. Where he undertaketh to vindicate two places of Scripture from determining Parity or Imparity in the Church. The first is *Mat. 20. 25.* to which is parallel *Luk. 22. 25.* *The Kings of the Gentiles exercise Authority over them, and they that exercise authority over them, are called Benefactors: but ye shall not be so.* Though I confess, there be other places more unquestionable to our purpose; yet I see not the weight of what he hath said against this place, being brought as an Argument against Imparity. His Answer is made up of two, First, he asserteth, and solidly proveth against *Papists*, that it is not the abuse of Power that is here forbidden, but that the Power it self spoken of is forbidden, as incompetent to Church-Officers; his Proofs for this I need not repeat, I accept it of him as a Concession. Secondly, He saith it is only Civil Power that is here forbidden; and so it doth not make against Imparity in Church-Officers, *Reply.* He keepeth his wonted way here, which is to take much pains, to prove what is least in debate with the adversaries he dealeth with: we do not question but the Power it self, not the abuse of it is here spoken against: but that it is Civil Power only we question; and that he hath not spent one word to prove. We affirm that Christ is here making a difference between his Apostles and Civil Governors in this; that one of them should not have Authority over another, as it is among Rulers of States and Kingdoms; and so that there should be no Imparity of Power among them; to prove this, I borrow the 3d reason by which *Mr. Still.* militateth against the abuse of Power being here meant, *viz.* This only can answer the Scope of the Apostles contention, which was about Primacy. The Sons of Zebedee would have been set over the rest, *Mat.*

20. and their Strife was, which should be *μείζων* pro *μείζων* (so *Drusus* cited by *Leigh Crit. Sac.*) that is, who should be Pope over the rest : now, though we deny not but theirs might be upon a Civil and Coactive Power, they were dreaming of an earthly Kingdome of Christ, yet sure, this was neither mainly nor only in their design : not only, because they could not but know that Christs Kingdome, in which they were to be Officers, should be Spiritual, and conversant about the things of another life, though they thought it might be Worldly to, and therefore it could not be ; but they designed a Supremacy in that respect also, not mainly, both because they could not but know that their main work both in teaching and ruling, was to be about the things of Eternity : as also it is evident from *Luk. 22. 24.* that their contention was about Supremacy in a Power that then they had begun to be partakers of, *οτι αυτοις δοκει ειναι μείζων* : but they knew very well that yet they had no Civil Power : seeing then they contended about Ecclesiastical Supremacy, and Christs answer is suited to their Intention, and doth wholly discharge that Power whereof it speaketh : the first of which I have proved ; the two latter *Mr. Still.* hath confessed : it followeth, that Christ doth here forbid all Superiority of the Apostles, one over another : so that not only Christ had not set one over the rest but he will not permit themselves to do it if they would : *ἢ ὅτι* is a Simple forbidding of it. Hence I inferre the Argument to our purpose thus, if the Apostles who had received equal power from Christ, might not delegate that Power to one whom they might set up as chief ; then Presbyters may not do this neither, *Ergo* Imparity of Presbyters is unlawful. The consequence is evident, the antecedent I prove from parity of Reason : it is not imaginable that Presbyters may set one of themselves over themselves : and that Bishops may not do the like, and Apostles the like ; seeing order may require the one as well as the other. Yea, Secondly, if there be a disparity of reason it maketh much for us, for sure the Apostles had more

liberty of managing that Power, they had received from Christ, by prudence, than Pastors now have; wherefore they might far rather restrain the exercise of it in themselves, if they saw cause, than we may do. 3. I hope it will not be denied, that what is here said to the Apostles is not said to them as Apostles; but as Officers of the Church, who have received the same Power from Christ: that it is not Temporary, but an abiding precept: and therefore it forbids superiority among the Apostles, so doth it among Presbyters, *Mr. Still. p. 220. objecteth thus*; 'this place doth no waies imply a Prohibition of all inequality among Governours of the Church; for then the Apostles Power over ordinary Pastors should be forbidden. *Ans. concedo totum*: we also grant inequality among Pastors and Elders. But that which we plead is, that here is forbidden an inequality among them who are of the same Order: that when Christ hath given men the same Power and Office, as he did to the Apostles; they may not usurp power one over another, nor take it though others would give it them. This is clearly proved from what hath been said. And further, it may be hence also concluded, that the inequality which is among Church-Officers ought not to be such as is among the Governours of the World, where a single Person may have his under-Officers at his command: but that inequality must be of one order above another in place and rank, both which do concur jointly to the ruling of the Church; and thus also Episcopacy is here made unlawful. That Pride and Ambition is here forbidden, I readily grant him: but that these are not only forbidden, is clear from what hath been said.

Sett. 2. The next place that he considereth is *Mat. 18. 15, 16, 17.* Where, after private admonition is used in vain, we are commanded to tell the Church, and they who do not hear the Church, are to be counted as Heathens and Publicans. That which he first bringeth for an Answer to this place is, 'That because men of all Opinions about Church-Government make Use of it to establish their Opinions, therefore no Argument may be drawn from it for any

any opinion. This unhappy way of reasoning I have met with before, and insist not now on it. It is the Devils way, to perceive, to raise contentions about truth among some; and having done this, to tempt others by these contentions to Schism and slighting of truth. But we must not quit the light held forth in this Scripture, because men have darkened it, by their raising dust about it: let us search the more soberly and carefully, not cast away the truth for this. Yet for all divers Opinions that have been broached about this place, Mr. *Stilling.* hath a new one of his own, which I shall briefly examine. 'The difficulty of the place (he saith well) lyeth in these twō. 1. What are the offences here spoken of. 2. What is the Church mentioned. For the first, he asserteth (with more confidence than strength of Reason, when he saith, it is evident to any unprejudicated mind,) that the matters are not of scandal; but of private offence and injurie: this he proveth p. 222. (his Arguments we shall consider after.) For the Church, he proposeth at length the *Erastian* opinion, as very plausible: yet at last rejecteth it p. 224, 225. and returns to the Offences p. 226. 'which though he makes to be private differences and quarrels; yet he will not have them to be law-suits, nor Civil causes; but such differences as resp. to persons, and not things. And then he determineth p. 227. that the Church is not here any Juridical Court acting by Authority; but a select Company, who by arbitration may compose and end the difference: and so concludeth p. 228. that here is nothing about Church-Government; though by Analogie some things about it may be hence drawn. This is the sum of this opinion, which I shall first refute and then consider his grounds for it.

Sect. 3. And first of all I cannot but wonder that this learned Author should with so much confidence deny this place to speak of Church-Government; and not say something in answer to the many Arguments for establishing a Form of Government, which are drawn from it by many learned men; as *Gillespy* in his *Aarons Rod.* *Rutherford* in his *Jus Divin. Reg. Eccles.* *Beza de Excom.* & *Presbyt. Cawdry*

dry of Church-reformation; and other Presbyterians: beside many Authors of other judgments. What? are all their Arguments unworthy to be taken notice of, and easily blown away with Mr. *Still*. his bare Assertion? for what he saith of the matters of offence spoken of in this place, he seemeth to aim at a new opinion, but I cannot see wherein it differeth from what the *Erastians* hold, save in its obscurity: for when he hath with them, made them to be no Scandals nor Sins against God, but private injuries against our Neighbours; he will not have them to be Civil causes, or Law-suits; but such differences as respect Persons, not things. What these can be I cannot understand: for what wrong can I do to my Neighbour: besides scandalising him by Sin against God, for which he may not Sue me at Law: if he mean not matters of Money or *meum & tuum*, but other injuries against ones Person, as beating, reproaches, slanders &c. (as I guess he doth, so far as I can see his opinion through the midst of his words) these are yet Civil causes, and matters of Law-Suit: and this is the one part of what the *Erastians* here understand: neither do I see any reason for understanding these here, and not other private Injuries, as the *Erastians* do: for is it imaginable that Christ would prescribe this course for redress of wrongs in our own Persons and names, and not also for wrongs in our Estates? but it may be he meaneth that though the injuries here meant, be in matters Civil; yet the design of the place is not to prescribe a way of making up the injury, but of taking away the animosities, and quarrels that these injuries breed among Christians; but this cannot hold; for sure the best way of allaying the animosities that arise about injuries done by one to another, must be by determining what is the due of each, and who doth, and who sustaineth the wrong; and so making reparation of the injury done. We must not then think that Christ hath appointed one course for repairing the wrong; and another for taking away contention about it: but it is his Will that Christians in such cases, either let their wrongs be judged by the arbitration of Friends; or if that cannot be,

by that law : and whethersoever of these waies the matter
 be determined; that they should acquiesce, and not contend
 any more. Besides this, when I receive a private injurie
 from another, it is my duty to lay aside all grudge and ani-
 mosity against him, which if I be willing to do, why should
 the matter be brought before others, or to the Church? if
 I be not willing to do it, it is not like that I will bring it
 thus to others, who may persuade me to lay aside animosity
 against him. I cannot understand how I can bring a
 matter of private wrong to be judged by others, except it
 be in reference to the getting of some reparation of that
 wherein I conceive my self to be wronged. If he mean
 that I should bring the matter before others, not that my
 animosity may be laid aside (that being my duty without
 such adoe) but that they may persuade him who hath
 wronged me to lay aside his grudge, and be reconciled to
 me: sure this cannot be the Scope of the place, both be-
 cause Christ giveth another rule in that Case, which will
 sooner attain that end, *viz.* Forgive him, *Lu.* 17. 3. and indeed
 it is a more compendious way to allay his fury, to carry it
 dutifully, friendly and kindly to him, than to convent him
 before others. Also because it is a strange reflection of the
 Sense of the expression, *Trespasse against thee i. e.* refuse to
 be reconciled to thee: sure there is no Warrant in Scrip-
 ture or reason from the notation of the word, thus to ex-
 pound it. And besides all this, this exposition destroys the
 Authors opinion, *viz.* that this place is not meant of Scan-
 dals; for when one hath wronged me, and I am willing to
 forgive him and be at peace with him, and he refuseth to
 be reconciled to me; this is a Sin against God, and a Scan-
 dal of an high nature. Now why the place should be
 meant of taking away this sort of Scandal and no other
 (seeing other Scandals also are Sins against the Scandalized,
 as is clear *1 Cor.* 8. 12.) I think it is hard to conjecture
 except Mr. *Still*, must say so to make up the opinion that
 he intendeth to defend.

Señ. 4. But I shall now prove that this place speaketh
 purposely of Scandals, or Sins against God, whereby the

Consciences of others are offended; and not of private Injuries. And that briefly because this is largely and fully performed by all our Authors who write against *Erasmi*. 2. Our Lord had spent the former part of the Chapter about Scandals, especially in pressing your shunning to give offence, and in shewing the danger of offences; both to the offended, and especially to the offender, *vers.* 7. Now in all this discourse he had said nothing of the means of taking away of Scandals: wherefore seeing he joyneth these words we dispute about, to the former discourse of Scandal; it may be out of question that he is here laying down the way of removing these Scandals when they should arise in his Church, that the evils he had spoken of may not ensue upon them. 2. The design of this Remedy here prescribed is to gain the faulty Person: now this expression of gaining Men from that which is Evil, is in Scripture only used in reference to Sins against God, which are apt to destroy men, and whereby they are lost. 3. this evil from which the Person is to be gained, is Sin or Scandal. It is to be said that it is gaining of a brother, when he is Persuaded to lay aside animosity against a brother, and to be reconciled to him; this is true only and so far as such animosity is Sin: for on no other account, freeing of one from it can be called gaining him in Scripture-Phrase; and if these animosities be here spoken of only as they are Scandals, then the Scope of the place is to redress Scandals; for *à quatenus ad omne valet consequentia*. 3. To sin against a brother is (in the Phrase of the New Testament) mainly, if not only, to wrong his Conscience or Spiritual Estate by Scandal. *1 Cor.* 8. 12. or to be guilty of Sin against God in his sight or conscience *Luk.* 15. 18, 21. so *Luk.* 17. 3, 4. Neither can any instance be brought where it signifies a private injury as such; therefore it must be meant of Scandal. 4. In redressing of private Injuries in a charitable way, it is not usual to lead Witnesses: but these belong to a judicial proceeding; but here the matter is to be established by Witnesses. *Ergo* it is a matter not to be transacted in such a way as this Author would have these private Injuries. 5. It is unimaginable

imaginable that Christ would have us count our Brother a
 then or a Publican, and would have him bound in
 for persisting in a fact that either is no sin against
 God, or which is not considered as a sin against God:
 the Holy Ghost any where speak so of private inju-
 ries considered as such? no sure; but if private injuries
 be thus noted with censure by God and Men, it is
 the notion of heinous sins as they offend God and
 scandalize his people, and if so: then Scandals are here
 meant; for if such injuries be here spoken of for that
 which is common to other Scandals, and especially pri-
 vate injuries not particularly mentioned, but set down un-
 der the general name of Sin; what a boldness is it to ex-
 ceed other sins, and make these only to be here spo-
 ken of?

¶ 5. Next, I come to consider his Notion about the
 remedy, to which these offences must at last be brought
 to: 'It is, saith he, no juridical Court, but a se-
 cret company called together by the party offended, who
 by arbitration may compose and end the difference. A-
 gainst this Conceit I bring these Reasons: 1. This com-
 pany is to be called together by the offended party; for the
 business carrieth the whole managing of the business to be by
 him; and it is very like the stubborn offender will not be
 satisfied in this: now, is this a way that our Lord would
 prescribe for taking away the distemper of a galled mind,
 his Adversary (so the stubborn offender looketh upon
 the other) should chuse the persons before whom he is to
 be judged, and who should judge him? this I cannot be-
 lieve, except I see more proof of it than our
 Lord's bare saying it is so. 2. We must conceive that
 the three steps of proceeding here prescribed, have some
 difference one from another, and are remedies of
 different Vertues and operations applied to this stubborn
 offender. Now the first step is secret Admonition: the se-
 cond is Private and Charitable, not Judicial; the third then
 must be different from both: which I cannot conceive how
 it can be not authoritative. In this Authors opinion,
 it

it is no more but this, when two or three Friends can accommodate the matter, then take a few more, having more but the same power the former two or three had: no what great influence can 5, or 6, or 10 have to persuade a stiff offender, more than 2 or 3 using the same motive? 'tis not to be imagined that the difference can be such. Christ intendeth when he prescribeth this as a remedy that evil the other could not cure. 3. When Christ is prescribing a cure for offences which may fall out among his people, and is so exact in describing all the steps and final result thereof; we must conceive that his last will be such as will effectually root out that evil so, as it do not any more hurt his Church or those who are harmed by it. Now if the last mean be only arbitration, and juridical authoritative act, this end can never be attained for neither is the stubborn offender gained, nor is he taken away that he may not the same way trouble the other as before. What great matter is gained if the wilful person will not hear this advising Church our Author dreameth he is still a Church-member, enjoying the publick fellowship of the people of God, for all that these arbitrators do: and suppose some do withdraw private intimacy from them, yet we cannot think that all are obliged to it by authority of private arbitrators declaring him stubborn when all do not know the causes which made them so to termine, nor the proofs that did convince them of the truth of what was alledged against him. It is then evident that the last Remedy of the miscarriage (be what it will) of a stubborn offender which Christ here prescribeth, is an authoritative act, and therefore the Church here is no company of private men for arbitration. 4. Though we grant that the *ἐκκλησία* signifieth any company called together, yet it must be of more restricted signification; and must signify a company called out of the World by the Gospel to worship God, and to serve him in the managing of his affairs and institutions; which is not applicable to a company of arbitrators called by a man, not by the Gospel to agree contending parties; which is a work of duty com-

all the World, and none of the special works of the Church as distinguished from other Societies. Now that word *Church* must be thus understood, and not as Mr. *W*ould have it, I prove 2dly; It is constantly used by the Writers of holy Scripture; neither can an instance be brought in all the New Testament where any *ecclesia* is put for a company met about any business, save the Town-Clerk of *Ephesus* used it otherwise, *Acts* 19, and *Luke*, speaking of him in his own dialect, useth it as he did, *ver.* 40. But when Christ here speaketh of a Church to which he sendeth his offended people by a standing Law for the redress of their grievances, we must certainly conceive that he will have them by the *Church*, to understand that which is ordinarily known by that name in the New Testament; for how should they know the meaning of an ambiguous word, but by the constant Use of it in Scripture? 2. The demonstrative article added in the next putteth the matter beyond all question, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, signifieth a particularly designed Church, which they to whom it is said, have pointed out unto them: not any Church, this or that, an *individuum vagum*, or such a Church as themselves may particularize or pitch upon: it is not *a Church*, but *[the] Church*. Now a company of arbitrators chosen *ad libitum* by the grieved party, are not *ἐκκλησία* *[the] Church* particularly, as *individuum determinatum* designed by Christ; they are at best but *[a] Church*, and should be here designed only *confuse*, or *vage*, *aut illi ecclesia*, which the word cannot bear. Now we take it for a Ruling-church, or whatever Church in scripture-sense, it is here determined what Church we should bring the matter to, *viz.* that particular Church we are in (at least in *prima instantia*) and it is not left to our liberty to chuse what Church of many particulars we will explain unto. Or if we take the article here prefixed to prove the *ἐξουχὴ* of that Church here spoken of, and to determine the word to its *famosius significatum*; it hath the same strength of an argument: for, not a company of private

private Arbitrators, but Christians, or their Representatives met for the worship of God, or administration of the affairs of his House, are that Church.

Scd. 6. I come now to examine what Mr. Still hath to say against this interpretation of the place, or for which himself hath devised. P. 222. he undertaketh to prove that the Offence here spoken of is not any scandalous Sin against God, but a private injury. 'His arguments are 1. from the parallel place, *Luke 17. 3.* If thy brother shall trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. 'this is private injury, because a private Brother may give it, which is not in his power were it a scandal to the whole Church, unless we make every private person excommunicate and release one another. *Ans. T.* *Luke 17. 3, 4.* is parallel to *Matth. 18. 15, 16, 17.* I do not question; and indeed all the Commentators that I have met with, make them relate to the same passage of Church preaching: but this (if we may lay any weight on the judgment of men) doth make much against Mr. Still. he understandeth *Matth. 18.* not of Scandals, but of bare injury, so then must this place also, but the Text and context both do make it evident, as I conceive, that this is not meant of Private Injuries (but in so far as they are Scandals) but of scandalous sins: I say the context doth prove it; because our Lord is there speaking of Scandals, it is the very purpose that he is upon *ver. 1, 2.* The Text also proveth it, for the first remedy to be applyed to the evil, is Rebuke: which is known to be a more proper remedy for Scandal than private wrong: and then, the first of this remedy, Repentance, doth relate to Scandals rather than to private wrongs. Neither doth it follow that it is private injury, because a private person may forgive it; we must understand it of private Scandal, not such as is publick, and a scandal to the whole Church, as Mr. Still supposeth. Now when the Offender repenteth upon private Rebuke, the Rebuker may forgive him 3 ways: 1. by not charging him any more with guiltiness, but looking on him, as one whom the Lord hath pardoned. That this

ed *forgiveness* in Scripture, is clear, 2 Cor. 2. 7. 10.
 ere the whole Church is commanded thus to forgive the
 communicated man who had repented. 2. By exerci-
 that Christian familiar love toward him, which we
 ht not to exercise towaad them who live in sin. 3. By
 earing to bring the matter to any more publick hear-
 which, had not the party repented, had been his duty.
 y this giveth not a power of Excommunicating and re-
 ng to a private person; but only a power of the pru-
 use of our own charity. His second Answer is the
 only built on another Scripture, *Math. 18. 20.* 'Where
 ult in answer to *Peter's* Question, bids us *forgive out bro-*
as oft as he repenteth. The answer is also the same;
 we must forgive a scandalous Brother (in the way but
 laid down) as oft as he repenteth; and not bring him
 publick Rebuke, but in case of obstinacy. His 3d. argu-
 is this, If this be matter of Scandal that is here spo-
 of; then might a matter of Scandal be brought before
 Church when there is no way to decide it, there being
 ne privy to it, who is the Accuser, he affirmeth, and
 Offender denyeth. *Ans. 1.* Doth not this same in-
 convenience follow if the matter be a private Injury? May
 not in that case be no way for the Arbitrators to de-
 the matter, the Offender denying, and the injured
 affirming, and that where himself is the party? The
 er then is as much obliged to answer this argument
 are. But 2dly, This inconvenience is easily avoided
 if the grieved person be the only witness of the fact,
 he offender deny the fact, it ought not to come before
 church, neither is this injunction to be understood of
 cases: but where either the fact is known to more
 one (for even so it may be a private and no pub-
 ffence) or where the Offender doth not deny the
 but denyeth that it is wrong: in that case, first two
 ee, then the whole Church must endeavour to con-
 him. It is a bad consequence; some works of dark-
 or want of witness, cannot be decided by the Church;
 We are not commanded to bring scandals before the
 Church.

Church. That which he addeth p. 223. 'That Christ
 'speaketh as to an ordinary case, and in allusion to w
 'was then in Use among the *Jews*; which was to repro
 'one another, commanded *Lev. 19. 17.* and for neglect
 'which, *Jerusalem* was thought to be destroyed by *R. Ch*
 'na. : This I say, is nothing to the purpose; for I suppose
 these Reproofs, *Lev. 19. 17.* and which are mentioned
 that Rabby, were not only for private Injuries, but ma
 ly for sin against God: wherefore this consideration
 keth not a little against the design for which it
 brought. P. 224. 'He will not have the Church
 'spoken of to be the Christian Church; because, saith
 'Christ is speaking to a present case, and layeth down
 'present Remedy. Now if he lay down Rules for
 'verning his Church; this could not be, because
 'were yet no Ecclesiastical Courts for them to appeal to
 'then the case had presently fallen out, they were left
 'out a redress, having no Church to tell it unto. And
 cannot be proved that Christ here layeth down Rules
 case presently practicable, more than he doth when he
 powereth his Apostles, and chargeth them concerning
 work, *Matth. 16. 19.* *John 20. 23.* *Mal. 28. 19.* and
 will have them to delay a while before they should put
 that power in act. *Luke 24. 49.* And indeed we have
 better cause to think that he is telling his people what
 do in the after and ordinary times of his Church, than
 they should do in that present and extraordinary case,
 the Church was not yet framed, and when they had him
 personally to go to for direction. 2dly, However we
 tain that this Rule, as it serveth for our times, so mig
 serve for that time in which it was spoken: for if the
 had then fallen out, though there were not the ordi
 Ecclesiastical Courts to go to, that now ought to be
 there wanted not a visible Church-power residing in
 person of Christ, and after in the Apostles, to whom
 succeed the ordinary Judicatures: so that the offend
 ty wanted never a Church to make his complaint unto
 do not say that [*Tell the Church*] doth directly

any other to which the complaint was to be made, but the ordinary guides of the Church; for our Lord accommodated his terms he useth to the ordinary cases in which this was to take place; but by Analogie, it is applicable to any who in extraordinary cases act the part of the ordinary Guides of the Church.

Sec. 7. I agree to the argument of Mr. *Gillespy*, cited by the Author, that unless we understand the word Church as usual, it would be no easie matter to know what Christ here meant by the Church; for seeing this was to be a standing Law in all Ages, 'tis not imaginable that the Lord would have us otherwise understand the terms of it than are ordinarily used in the Bible, which he intended should constantly be in his Peoples hands. Neither is that any weight which our Author opposeth to this; that as so argue would do well to consider, how those whom Christ spake, should apprehend his meaning, if he spake in a sense they never heard of before. We consider that they may easily understand Christs words, because he had often before spoken to them of the Gospel-church, as *Matth. 16. 19.* and frequently under the notion of the *Kingdom of Heaven*; which they might easily apprehend to be meant by the Church. Wherefore the Author did not well consider what he said, when he supposed the language to be unknown to the Disciples. Hence all the faith of the way of understanding Scripture in the use of the words then common, is not to this purpose; Christ had made this sense common among them. Neither must we understand the word as it was then common, as apprehended among the *Jews*, but as it was apprehended among Christs ordinary Hearers, who were in expectation of another Church, and another way of Government to be set up, than was then among the *Jews*. I find more in the Author that is argumentative either against the opinion of this Text, or for his own. He concludeth in §. 8. that this place, though it speaks not of Church-governement, yet it may have some influence on it by way of

of Analogy, viz. in proving, 1. Gradual Appeals, 2. Church censures, 3. The lawfulness of Excommunication. That he yieldeth at least, that something of Church-Government may be inferred from this place: then *ex concessis*, is not so impertinent to this purpose as he would have made us believe in the beginning of this Chapter.

Señ: 8. But let us see if we can draw any more out of it than he will yield us. We have already proved it to be directly meant of Church-Government, and to give Rules for the right managing of it: now I assert, that it doth implicitly determine the form of Church-Government, viz. That it ought to be by Parity, not Episcopacy, which I thus make out: The first Authority before which the complaint of the grieved party is to be brought, is the Church, (and it is also the last:) but if the Church were governed by Bishops, this should not be, *Ergo*, The Church ought not to be governed by Bishops. The Major is clear for after secret and private admonition (which are not authoritative) immediately succeedeth [*Tell the Church*] sure this Church must be that Authority which we must resort to *prima instantia*, and also that which must finally decide the matter; seeing Excommunication doth immediately follow upon Disobliging this Authority. The Minor I prove thus: in the Episcopal way, the complaint must be brought to the Bishop or to his Delegate or Delegates (which is all one as to the matter of Authority) and he must be the last that must determine, and on disobedience to him followeth Excommunication: but the Bishop is not the Church, *Ergo*, In the Episcopal way complaint cannot be made to the Church, nor doth the Church finally decide the matter. The Minor of this last Syllogism is evident; for neither the nature of the word, nor Scripture-Use will bear, that one Man shall be called the Church. If it be said that Episcopacy be so modelled, as the Bishop with the Presbyter may judge of the offence, and they may well be called the Church. *Ans.* In that case, either Presbyters have a decisive Vote as well as the Bishop, or they be only his Advisers. In the first case the Bishop

only a *Preses*: which is not that Episcopacy pleaded against, though we judge it inconvenient. In the 2d, the Bishop is the only Power, and therefore there is no such Church as here meant, for the Church here is a Church clothed with Authority, whom the party ought to hear, *i.e.*, obey, and for contumacy against which he is Excommunicated: but the Bishop and his counsel is not such a Church; for his counsel hath no Authority, and himself cannot make a Church; and therefore both taken together, make no Church having Authority.

CHAP. VI.

HERE Mr. *Stilling*. doth undertake to lay aside Apostolical practice from being a pattern for us in the matter of Church-Government; What success he hath in this attempt we now examine. His two main scopes in this Chapter, are, that it cannot be known what the practice of the Apostles was in this; and that if it were known, it is no binding example to us; which desperate assertions do, not a little, reflect upon the Scripture and tend to the setting loose the Government of the Church. The latter of them I have spoken to before, and purpose to examine what he saith for it. Concerning the former, I shall premise but this to our trying of his proofs, that it is very strange the Spirit of God in Scripture hath written so much of their practice, both Historically, and implied it in Doctrinal assertions and Precepts, if for all this we cannot know what it was; which if it do not accuse the Scripture-relation of things of great imperfection, I know nothing: for I am sure the Scripture doth purposely set down much of their practice, both in Preaching, administration of Sacraments, ordination of Officers, directing these Officers in their behaviour in the House of God, censures and

and other parts of Government: if yet we cannot know by Scripture what was their way in Ruling; the account given of these things must be very imperfect. I believe would be imputed to any Writer of the History of a Church if out of his History could not be gathered what was the Government of that Church: shall we then think the Sacred Writers, who have undertaken to give us an account of the acts of the Apostles, are so deficient? especially many of the writings of the Apostles themselves being added by the same Spirit; out of which much may be gathered to this purpose. But let us hear how he makes out this his strange opinion. I insist not on what he writeth of the Apostles Commission; I confess the form of Government is not expressed in it: though we have ground to think, that when Christ chargeth them to teach his People to observe all he commanded them, *Matth. 28. 20.* that it was his Will that they should not leave so great a matter as is the form of Church-Government to men's Will; but that his Institution should be observed in this especially seeing he spent 40 days with them before his Ascension, *Acts 1. 3.* speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God, that is the Gospel-Church: it is hard to think that among all his Instructions to them that he told them nothing of his Will about the way of governing his Church. Neither do I take notice of his large Discourse about the Division of Provinces among the Apostles: nor of his too true observation, that looking on ancient practice through the Glass of our own customs, hath bred many mistakes: only I wonder at his bringing that for an instance, that Lay-Elders are proved from the name Presbyters: I believe there was never any that used such an Argument, seeing the name is common to them and Preaching-Elders. He will find stronger arguments than this for that Order of Church-Officers, if he please to read the Assertors of it.

Señ. 2. For clearing what was Apostolical Practice he layeth down this as a foundation, *p. 239, &c.* 'That the Apostles in the forming Churches did observe the custom

of the Jewish Synagogue. About this Notion he spendeth
 a huge deal of pains, as if the strength of his cause lay
 there; but to what purpose it is, except to shew his reading
 and skill in Antiquity, I know not. Doth it follow, the
 Apostles imitated the *Jews* in the matter of Church-Gov-
 ernment, *Ergo*, we are not obliged to imitate the Apostles?
 Should think that the contrary consequence might rather
 be inferred; but whatever be of that, this we are sure of,
 that whether there was any coincidence or similitude be-
 tween the Apostolical and the Jewish way, or not; Whe-
 ther the Apostles in what they did had an eye at the Jewish
 example, or not: they were acted by an infallible Spirit,
 which did both guide them unerringly, and warrant them
 unquestionably to do what they did in the management of
 Church-Government, so that it is not the occasion of
 their taking such or such a way that we are to look to;
 but the morality of it, that should determine us to fol-
 low it, because we know it is the will of Christ. Where-
 fore I might pass without any more notice all that he writ-
 eth in many sheets of the modelling the Government of
 the Church by that of the Synagogue. Yet for further
 clearing the matter, I shall lay down a few Considera-
 tions.

Sec. 3. First, I take notice how inconsistent this Au-
 thor is with himself in this Point; for p. 322. he assert-
 eth, 'That the Apostles did not observe (in probability)
 one fixed course of settling the Government of Churches,
 but settled it according to the several circumstances of pla-
 ces and persons which they had to deal with. I hope he
 will not deny, but the Jewish way of Government was
 the same and the same every where: How then did the Apostles
 settle that, if they were so various in their settling of Go-
 vernment? sure if they did not stick to one form, they
 did not stick to the Jewish form. But I perceive he would
 not say any thing that might cast Church-Government at
 uncertainty; however the ways he taketh to this end,
 doth not clash one with another. 2. All this pains he taketh,
 doth either to prove nothing, or to prove that which
 himself

himself will not own: for suppose that he had evince
 that the Apostles did imitate the *Jews* in their Church
 administrations: if any thing follow, it must be this, that
 these things which were done by the Apostles on such
 account are not now binding, but are indifferent and de-
 terminable by men: and that as the Apostles had their li-
 berty in imitating the *Jews*, or not, so we have our li-
 berty in imitating the Apostles, or not, in them. Now
 I am sure he dare not own in most of these things which
 he maketh to have been taken up from the Jewish customs
 for he speaketh, p. 240. ' of Christs taking many Rites
 ' the Lords Supper from the *postcenium* among the *Jews*
 ' and the Use of Baptism from the Baptisms used in imi-
 ' ting Profelytes, and Excommunication from their pu-
 ' ting out of the Synagogue; and afterward he maketh
 ' building of Churches, to be taken from the Synagogue
 ' publick reading of the Scripture, and Pastors from
 ' *Archisynagogi*: Ordination from that used among
 ' *Jews*: Will then Mr. *Stilling.* say that all these are
 ' indifferent. That Baptism, Excommunication, Pastors
 nay Ordination are no Institutions of Christ; and that
 the Apostles took them from the *Jews ad placitum*:
 we may take them from the Apostles, or leave them, as
 list. Sure he will not say it: and if he saith not this,
 saith nothing, but *magno conatu nihil agit: parturiunt mu-
 res: nascetur ridiculus mus.* 3. It is needful to distinguish
 the things that the Apostles did by imitation take from
 the *Jews*, by confounding of which Mr. *Stilling.* ha-
 mired himself and his Reader too. There are 1. some
 things that are the dictates of Nature and Reason: as that
 publick assembling be ordinarily in some one convenient
 place: that in a Society there be Rulers and Ruled: that
 where many Rule they meet together for that end: that
 in their meeting one preside, to avoid confusion, &c.
 2. There are other things which be the commandments
 of God concerning his moral Worship; as that Prayer
 Praises, pullick reading of his Word, with opening of
 that his people may know his Will, be performed in a

solemn meetings of his people. 3. God's ceremonial Wor-
 ship, which consisteth in the observance of Rights fa-
 voured, or peculiar to Religion, without which all that
 Worship of God might well be performed, which is, and
 hath been of moral and perpetual Obligation. 4. Such
 things as receive their usefulness and fitness from custom:
 as Words, Habits, Gestures, &c. Now for the first two
 sorts, though there was co-inciding in them, between the
 Jewish and Apostolical way (and indeed it could not be
 otherwise, Nature and what is of moral Obligation being
 the same unto all) yet that the Apostles were determined
 in these by the Jewish Example, we deny. For the 3d,
 it is clear, that the Apostles used no such things with the
 Jewish Church, except a few for a time to avoid Scandal,
Acts 15. 28. 29. Yea, they are declared unlawful to be
 used, *Gal.* 4. 9, 10. and 5. 1, 2. *Col.* 2. 16, 17. which I
 am elsewhere to shew more at length. The 4th sort of
 things we hold to be in themselves indifferent, and deter-
 minable by the laudable custom of every place. Neither
 do we deny the Apostles to have in many of these imitated
 the Jewish Church; and no wonder, because they lived
 among them. Now Church-Government having in it
 some things of all these sorts, it is clear from what hath
 been said, how far we confess the Apostles to have follow-
 ed the *Jews* in it; and how far not. That wherein we are
 likest to controvert with Mr. *Still.* is, about things of the
 third sort, which I must yet distinguish: they were either
 such as the Lord had commanded to the *Jews*, or such as
 they without his command did take up. The former, he doth
 not alledge that the Apostles followed the *Jews* in. The
 latter he asserteth, and we deny it; and shall anon hear
 what he bringeth for his Assertion. But for further clear-
 ing this and the whole matter, I lay down a fourth con-
 sideration, *viz.* to make it out, that the Apostles did imi-
 tate the *Jews*, there are two things required. 1. To shew
 the co-incidency of their practice. 2. To shew that this
 co-incidency did proceed from a design of conformity, *viz.*
 that the Apostles were determined in such things by the
 Jewish

Jewish Example: for the former without the other is no imitation, because in imitation, the former practice must have some influence on that which followeth; such as the exemplary cause hath on the *exemplatum*. Now if the Apostles did (in some of these) the same things with the Jewish Church, only accidentally, or upon other motives and did not (as Mr. *Stilling.* phraseth it) copy out the Jewish way of Government, 'tis no imitating of them.

Señ. 4. From what hath been said, it will be easie to maintain against Mr. *Stilling.* large Discourse, that the Apostles did not in the Government of the Church imitate the Jewish Synagogue as their Pattern; I shall touch such things in his Discourse as seem to prove it. And 1. I take notice of that which was occasionally touched before, p. 240. viz. 'That Christ delighted to take up the received practices among the *Jews*, as the *Postcanium* he turned to the Lords Supper, Baptism of Profelytes, imitated to Christian Baptism, casting out of the Synagogue to Excommunication. And this he saith he did with Rites, not which were originally founded on *Moses's* Law; but which were brought in by a confederate Discipline among themselves. This, saith he, hath been abundantly manifested by many learned men; of which he cited some in his Margin. I confess, many learned Men, especially such as have spent their pains in Critical Learning, have done but bad service to Christ and his institutions, while to serve their *Phænomena*, and make their critical Conjectures the more plausible, they have made Mens devices like *Mazentius* his bed to curtail or stretch out Christs Institutions by them at their pleasure. But the Authority of such Men, though never so learned, shall not perswade me (what their Reasons may do I say not, till I hear and consider them) to think that Christ had such delight in Mens inventions in the Worship of God, as to make them the Pattern of his Gospel-institutions; and that rather than the Ceremonies, which of old were of divine Authority: shall we think that he who condemneth Mens Doctrines in Gods Worship, as vain, *Mal. 15. 9.* and especially in that Chapter, condemneth a Ceremony brought

brought in by confederate Discipline, which in it self was
 as harmless as any of these mentioned; viz. often Wash-
 ing: shall we think, I say, that he had such pleasure in
 these things? sure he cannot be so unlike himself. Neither
 am I sure can the Assertors of this Paradox, shew any such
 difference between that Ceremony and these here instan-
 ced, as that Christ should hate the one, and delight in the
 other. For that often alledged, that the *Pharisees* placed
 much Religion in their often Washings (besides that the
 thing simply, not their opinion, is condemned in the place
 cited) it cannot be made out, that they placed more Re-
 ligion in this, than they did in their *Postcæniæ*, washing of
 profelytes, &c. For further Answer to this Assertion of our
 authors, I add, that supposing Christ did make his Instituti-
 ons to consist of some material acts, like to these of the
 with uncommanded observations (for this is the fur-
 nest, that the Authors consideration can pretend to prove)
 doth not follow that he approved of these inventions:
 either that we may mould the affairs of the Church
 by our Reason and skill without Scripture; and that for
 these Reasons; 1. From Christs Wisdom. 2. From his
 authority which did warrant him to do such things, and
 both not make it lawful for the Church now to do them.
 I say, from his Wisdom: he is an able and competent
 judge of what is suited to Gospel-worship, and what not:
 and therefore of these unwarranted Observations in Use a-
 mong the *Jews*, he could chuse what was fittest for his
 designs (the things being indifferent in themselves) and
 appoint them in his Church: we cannot so well judge of the
 fitness of a thing to his design in the Gospel-model of af-
 fairs; and therefore must not take such liberty in doing
 what Man hath done without a special institution of Christ.
 Moreover, he knew well how in the depth of his Wisdom
 to make such a choice in his institutions serve unto two
 great ends, viz. the gaining of the *Jews*, by making as
 little difference between the old way (to which they were
 wedded) and the new Gospel-way, as could be: and the
 adorning of his Gospel-service with most fit and excellent

Ceremonies : this cannot be pretended for devices of Men in Gods Worship, whether found out by themselves, or wherein they imitate others. 2. For his Authority, how ever these Observations being uncommanded were on the account unlawful to the *Jews* ; yet the things materially considered being indifferent, and Christ having absolute Authority to institute particulars in his Church, he might well chuse these, and seal them with his Authority, and make them both lawful and duty to us ; this no Man can do ; they must have his Command for Institution ; and not make them by their own authority. Wherefore Christ taking the Jewish Customs for Patterns to his Institutions (as he did so) maketh nothing for Men's setting up their institutions in the Church ; or for the indifferency of things belonging peculiarly to the Church.

Señ. 5. That which he saith *ibid* : maketh little to his purpose, *viz.* 'That even when God did determine the particulars of Worship, he left the Morals to the wisdom and discretion of his People : which he instanceth in building and ruling Synagogues. *Ans.* this is true of such things as are of common concernment to Religion and other Actions ; we also allow such parts of Church-Government to be managed by Christian Prudence : his instance proves no more ; for we permit also the building of Churches to Christian prudence. But the question is about things proper to the Church as it is a Religious Society : these things we deny to have been left to prudence among the *Jews*, or to be now so left among Christians. I cannot yield to what he seemeth to aim at, when he saith, 'that though the reason of erecting Synagogues was builded on a command, *viz.* 'O having holy Convocations, yet they were not built for a long time after they came to the Land : I cannot think that the building of Synagogues was indifferent though the place and manner was : for the same command that requireth holy Convocations, requireth that there be a place fit for them. If they were at first long of building, it was either from some impediment, or from inexcusable negligence. Much less do I agree to what followeth, *viz.* 'Al

though

though *Moses* requireth the duty of Assembling, yet he prescribes no Orders for the place of meeting, nor for the manner of spending these dayes in Gods service, nor for the Persons who were to superintend the publick work. Ans. the first of these, as to the Circumstances of it, is left to Prudence, it being meerly a natural Circumstance of Worship, the second for substance is in the law, viz. What duties they should spend the day with, viz. Sacrificing in the Temple, reading the Law, and Teaching the People in other places : the natural Circumstances of this are also left to prudence. The third is falsely asserted : are not the *Levites* appointed to superintend that work when they are made the Publick Teachers of the People ? Wherefore all this maketh nothing for his design, viz. That the *Jewish* Church-Government was left to Prudence, and that the Christian should be so. Their reading of the Law we approve; but deny it to have been voluntary but commanded; their curious dividing of it, and leaving out some of it we disprove, as the fruit of the superstitions of the latter ages of that Church : and indeed it may be compared with the frame of our Service-Book, though it was not so good by far. I insist not on his guesses about the Government of Synagogues, which he taketh much pains to make appear to be like the Government in the Apostolick Church, that he might make us believe, that this was taken from that. I only observe that the product of all his pains is not *pro pretium* : both because of the uncertainty of the matter of Fact, that there were such Officers so employed in the Synagogues : as also the far off resemblances that are between them and Officers in the Christian Church ; as any attentive Reader may observe. And so I pass to p. 253. where he sheweth how far the Apostles in forming Christian Churches did follow the Jewish Pattern.

Señ. 6. I smile indeed to consider how Mr. *Still*. magnified this his notion, and judgeth this birth of his own rain; as that which with his Improvement (such as it hath yet received from no other) will be more conducive than any he knoweth to the happy end of Compiling our
 2 disse-

'differences about Church-Government. I hope I have said
 as much of this notion. p. 186. &c. as will make it to be
 of less esteem with unbyassed men. I profess I cannot yet
 understand, for all that I have meet with in this Author a-
 bout it, how this Notion should have any such effect; for the
 Question is not what pattern the Apostles followed, but
 much, as whether what they did was the Institution of Christ
 and whether we ought to follow them as our pattern: and
 to the determining of this I see very little or no Use of this
 notion which he so much crieth up. But to make it get
 entertainment he taketh much pains. First, he promiset
 some general considerations to make it probable: and shew
 eth next how the Apostles did imitate the Synagogue in
 particulars. Let us hear what probability it getteth from
 his Considerations. The 1 is, 'That Christ and his Disciples
 'and Christians afterward went under the name of *Jews*
 'that they kept Communion with the *Jews*, and observe
 'their Customes, not only which were commanded of God
 'but which they had taken up themselves, if they were no
 'contrary to Gods commands. Here are 3 or 4 considera-
 tions jumbled together, some of which are false, others true
 but prove not the Point. I shall answer them more distinc-
 ly than he hath set them down. And first for the name
 it is no wonder they were called *Jews*, for they were
 by nation: if at any time they owned themselves as of the
Jewish Religion, that proveth nothing; for this they might
 do because the *Jewish* Religion, as commanded of God, was
 the same in Substance with the Christian, see *Act*. 26. 22.
 It doth not from this follow that there were the same Ad-
 ministrations in the *Jewish* and Christian-Church. And
 in after-times the *Jews* and Christians were both reckoned
 as one body by the Heathens (for which he bringeth some
 proof p. 255. and 256.) yet it doth not follow, which he
 there inferreth, viz. That they observed the same Rites and
 Customs: for this mistake of the Heathens did proceed partly
 ly from the agreement that was between *Jews* and Chri-
 stians, as to most great points of Religion: partly from the
 Agreement of their Rites in this, that both were very un-
 like

like the Heathen Rites. Neither did the Heathens under-
 stand the difference between Jews and Christians, though
 wise men among them knew that there was a difference :
 this may be gathered from *Act. 18. 15.* and *Act. 25. 19,*
 &c. It doth not follow from this, that the Rites were the
 same. 2. For their keeping communion with the Jews, this
 both far less prove the point : and that because, 1. the
 time when they kept Communion with the Jews was
 when the Jewish Church was yet standing, and the Chri-
 stian not framed nor erected : our Author cannot prove
 that they kept Communion with them after the Christian
 churches were set up : for their going to the Temple and
 Synagogues to Preach, proveth nothing. For that they
 did because the People were there met, not because they
 would join in their Service. 2. Because it was fit for that
 time to yield to the Jews so far as was possible, that they
 might be gained to the Gospel : hence they observed even
 some of the legal Ceremonies, they being then indifferent :
 it followeth not that they did settle the ordinance and
 standing practices of the Church by the Pattern of the Sy-
 nagogue. *Paul's* being freely admitted into the Synagogue
 to Preach, proveth no more than we have granted : his
 descending to them did procure this, not his framing
 Gospel-Churches according to their mould, much less
 his design proved by the mistake of the believing
 Jews about the conversion of the Gentiles, and their being
 zealous for observing the Law of *Moses* ; yea and grant that
 they were zealous for the uncommanded Customes of their
 fathers, as he alledgeth. For this proceeded from their
 being bred up in these things, and their Ignorance of the
 will of God in abolishing them, and in calling of the Gen-
 tiles : and the Apostle's yielding to the Jews as far as might
 be for a time, was because he had not yet shewed the diffe-
 rence between the Gospel and Jewish Church, because they
 did not then bear it : but with what shadow of conse-
 quence doth it follow from this that the Apostles did after-
 wards frame the Christian Church after the model of the
 Jewish Church? For the 3^d, it is a bold and most false assertion,
 that

that Christ and his Disciples conformed to the uncommanded Customs of the Jews: yea they are accused for Non-conformity in this point *Matth. 15. 2.* And Christ defendeth them in it, and meerly on this Account, that the customs were the traditions of men, and humane doctrine which is true of all uncommanded Customs in Religion. But how proveth he this Assertion? he bringeth Instance. Christ observed the Feast of dedication: this is Impudently said; he walked in *Solomons Porch Jo. 10. 22, 23.* that he might have occasion to teach the People: but did he offer a Sacrifice, or observe any other rite or Custom of the Feast? we read no such thing, going to their Synagogues and teaching there was no uncommanded Custom. Washing the Disciples Feet a custom used by the Jews before the pasover (saith *Mr. Still.* but others say it was done between the 2 courses of the pasover) this Christ did and giveth a Mystical reason for it. *Jo. 13. 5.* but that he did it in Conformity to the Jewish Custom ('if any such there was) let it be proved, appointing Baptism I hold to have a better Foundation than the Jewish Custom, of this before; thus what he saith in prosecuting his First consideration, is answered: neither is it as yet probable that the Apostles imitated the Jews in framing the Gospel-Church.

Sect. 7. His 2d consideration p. 257. is that the Apostles framed Christian Churches out of Jewish Synagogues. What solid Proof for this he bringeth let us hear. We read 'saith he, how fearful the Apostles were to offend the Jews, and how ready to condescend to them in any thing that might be; and if *Paul* would yield to them in circumstances *1 Tim.* (a thing which might seem to cross the design of the Gospel) would he scruple to retain the old Morality of the Synagogue, when there was nothing in it repugnant to the doctrine of the Gospel? *Ans.* The Apostles first did yield very far to the Jews, because they could not at the beginning digest the taking down of the old frame of Worship, and setting up a new; hence they did conform to the Jews, for that time, as much as might be in their transient and occasional practices: but this reason did no

oblige them to frame their constitutions and practices of
 the Church that were to abide afterward, by the Jewish Pa-
 tern, because then the Gospel was fully promulgated, and
 the Will of Christ known to the new Gospel-Church, dif-
 fering from the old ; and in this case we are rather to think
 that the Apostles did not conform to the Jewish way in
 things not necessary ; because as at first, their work was to
 bring them to Christ, and so they yielded to them as much as
 might be ; so afterwards now their work was to bring them
 from *Moses*, and to this end it was fit to bring them off all
 those customs and waies which might keep that their Idol
 yet in their minds, as sure the Jewish customs might do ; Here
 is more then a shew of reason (which our Author requireth)
 why the Apostle should slight the constitution of the Jewish
 Synagogues ; and besides, it is reason enough why they should
 do this, if it be not proved that they did otherwise, seeing
 they were guided by an infallible Spirit, not led by mens
 Customs in their Actions. I find no further proof of
 this consideration, but that they did not only gather Churches
 out of Synagogues, but that in probability whole Syn-
 agogues in some places were converted. What ground
 there is for this probability I know not ; we read nothing
 of it, as we read of whole Houses converted : neither see I
 any reason to think that the Apostles did respect Synago-
 gues in their reforming Churches : they made the Churches
 of them who had before been in the Synagogues ; and that
 I believe they did according to the Peoples best conveniency
 for partaking of ordinances together : but that their Syna-
 gogues were their Pattern I see not. Another argument
 from the Jewish and Gentiles *Cetus*, he would fain be help-
 ed by ; but finding it weak, disputeth against it : where-
 fore we lay it aside, and come to his 3^d consideration p. 260.
 viz, 'the Synagogue-Model was most agreeable to the State
 of the Churches in Apostolick times ; because it was so
 ordered, as that it needed not depend on the Secular
 Power for attaining the end of Government. *Answer.*
 Wherein the Synagogue-Model was, in the nature of the
 thing fitted to the State of the Gospel, we do not say that
 the Apostles would reject such a good thing because used
 by

by the Synagogue ; only we deny that they used it because the Synagogue used it : so this proveth nothing. Further it proveth only co-incidency between the Church and Synagogue-Government in this general that both were such as might consist without Secular power : but divers particular forms may be of this nature ; so that there is no need from this consideration that the Church and the Synagogues be governed by the same Model.

Señ. 8. We see how probable he hath made this his assertion : he cometh *p. 261.* to shew what particular practices of the Synagogue, the Apostles did take up and follow ; and first he speaketh of their publick service in the Church : where all that he can attain to is this, ' that there was in the Church, as there had been in the Synagogue ' solemn Prayers, Praise, reading of Scripture, and teaching ' of the People out of it : all which are parts of Morish worship ; and would have been in the Church though there had never been a Synagogue to take example by ; he is forced to acknowledge a considerable difference, *viz.* ' omitting ' the reading the Sections of the Law as was done in the ' Synagogue, and celebrating the Lords Supper, which was ' not in it : which one consideration destroyeth all that he hath at so much pains to establish : for if Christ and his Apostles had made the Synagogue their pattern, they might easily have conformed to them in reading the Sections of the Law and taking the Lords Supper, from some of their customs as well as they did Baptism, as this Author alledgeth. Next he cometh *p. 264.* to ordination : about which he maketh a great deal of do, but to no purpose : for Ordination *i. e.* a Solemn setting of men apart for the Office of the Ministry, doth naturally follow as necessary to Order supposing that some should be in that Office and the work be not common to all, which I believe should have been in the Church whatever had been done in the Synagogue ; as for the Rite of it, laying on of hands, whether it was used in the Synagogue or not is not worth our enquiry, for it will not thence follow that the Apostles took it from the confederate discipline of the Synagogue (*i. e.* from their meetings

men-devised Customes) as our Author confidently asserteth: but all that he discourseth proveth not this, but only, if it prove any thing, that it was used in the Synagogue. I assert with more warrant that it was taken up both by the Synagogue and by the Apostles from the ancient custom of blessing, or dedicating any thing to God by this Ceremony: of this Judgment is *Calv. Inst. lib. cap. 4. Sect. bunc autem ritum fluxisse arbitror ab Hebraeorum more, qui quod benedictum est consecratum volebant, manuum impositione deo quasi representabant: sic Jacob benedicens Ephraim & Manasse, eorum capitibus manus imposuit: quod sequutus est dominus noster, cum super infantes precationem faceret: eodem ut arbitror significatu Judaei ex legis praescripto suis sacrificiis manus imponebant: quare apostoli per manuum impositionem cum se deo offerre significabant quem initiabant in ministerium: quanquam usui sit etiam super eos, quibus visibilis spiritus gratias conferebant.* We see then it was not the practice in Synagogue-Ordination only: but in many things else, and it is most probable that this Rite so constantly used in all Ages of the Church, in all cases of blessing or consecration hath something more in it than humane Institution in the Synagogue: the constant use of it by men infallibly guided, as *Abraham*, the Apostles, Christ himself; the commanding of it in the like case of consecration under the Law cannot but give it a stamp of Divine Authority. Yea we find the Levites thus ordained *Num. 8. 10.* wherefore all this his pains doth not prove that Gospel-Ordinance was taken up from the humane custom of the Synagogue. A few things in this his discourse shall further shortly take notice of. *p. 264, 265.* he will have Gospel-Ministers not to succeed (no not by Analogie) the Priests and Levites, but rather to the Officers in the Synagogues: for the Priests were not admitted by Solemn Ordination; but judged of their fitness, as to birth and body by the same ordination: but the Rulers of the Synagogues were admitted by Ordination: and if any of the Priests came to that Office, they as well as others had their peculiar designation and appointment to it. Here I reply. I believe that Gospel-Ministers did not properly succeed

to either of these; but stand upon another foundation, viz. Christs Institution: and so it is needless to enquire which of them they should succeed to. I yield also, that the name of Priests under the Gospel hath brought in the thing it self, and even the Mass: which ought not to be. 2. What can he design by this Discourse? Would he make the Office of the Ministry stand on no other bottom but imitation of the Synagogues Rulers; and these Rulers to be brought in by confederate Discipline, i. e. to be a humane invention? he say not this, he saith nothing to the purpose; but I hold he will not say it. 3. It is false, that the Priests were solemnly set apart for their Office; though they had it by birth, yet they behoved to be solemnly initiated to it; as I am sure Mr. *Still.* would not have said, that they were otherwise set apart but by the judgment of the *Sanhedrin* of their birth and body; if he had not in this so consulted Antiquity, as that he forgot to look into the Bible. I will not deny but there was such a Judgment to pass on them (neither ought Ministers be now admitted without trying yea the Scripture (which is surer than the *Talmud*) telleth us so much. *Ezr.* 2. 62, 63. Yet we find also their solemn setting apart to the Office described, *Exod.* 28. 41. & 29. 1. *Lev.* 8. 2, &c. And spoken of, *2 Chron.* 26. 18. The very Idol-Priests would not want this solemn setting apart, *2 Chron.* 13. 9. *Jud.* 17. 5, 12. Yea, our Authors own opinion everteth it self; for to what purpose was a public judging of them before their entry on the exercise of the Office, if there was no solemn admission of them to it? I am sure a solemn declaring them such as God had appointed his Priests to be (if there had been no more, they being kept from exercising the Office till this was done) was a solemn admission. 4. I would know who these other were who were Rulers of the Synagogue, and so Teachers of the people; at least Superintenders over Gods public Worship (as he elsewhere phraseth it) beside the Priests, if they were only Levites, or others also, as he seemeth to imply: and if any other but Priests and Levites were admitted to that Office, I would know *quo warranto*:

the Scripture speaketh of these as old Testament Teachers; Neh. 8. 9. & Chron. 17. 8, 9. and of none else, but immediately inspired Prophets. But I see Mr. *Stilling*. looketh more to Rabinical stories in these matters, than to the Bible : and to the customs of the Synagogue in the days of the Apostacy than to the commands of God, as he gave them, though they be rare who are made mad by too much Learning ; yet there are whom too much reading (without holding to the Scripture as the Rule) maketh to dote. I need not insult on what he writeth, p. 268, &c. of the Rite of laying on of Hands ; enough hath been said, to shew that it proveth not what he intendeth : nor on the persons ordaining in the Synagogue and in the Church ; of which see, p. 272, &c. for in both he confesseth abomination to have been done in common by those in Power ; and afterward without divine Warrant restrained to one : if Christ hath given power to all Presbyters to do it ; we must have some warrant to restrain this Power ere we dare do it ; but not this enough before.

Sect. 9. In his further prosecuting the correspondence of the Apostolick Church with the Synagogue : he speaketh p. 285. of the Order settled by the Apostles in the Churches wanted by them, for ruling of them : and first he maketh work about the name *πρεσβύτερος*, which is the same with *ἐπίσκοπος* used in the Synagogue ; but from his own Discourse it's clear how little weight is to be laid on this consideration, as to what he intendeth : seeing that name was never used to denote Power and Dignity, whether in Church or State, and so doth no more belong to the Synagogue than other things. I take notice of what he saith in the end of p. 286. If his design is not to dispute the Arguments of either party, (*viz.* those who conceive the Apostles settled the Government of the Church in absolute equality, or else by Superiority and subordination among the settled Officers of the Church) but to lay down these principles, which may equally concern both, in order to accommodation. But I humbly conceive, it was very incumbent upon him to answer the arguments of both parties :

ties : and they must be answered to us before we be obliged to receive his Doctrine (of which anon) that we cannot know what form the Apostles settled, and that they settled not any one form. For as long as arguments brought by either of the controverting parties do stand untaken away ; to prove that the Apostles settled this or that form the Judgment can never acquiesce in his opinion, that they settled none ; or that we cannot know what they settled. This is a strange way of disputing, especially when the design is to satisfy the Conscience in order to peace, and yielding up its opinion : to lay down such Principles to this end, with strong arguments standing against them, untouched or answered. 'Tis like Mr. *Stilling*. thinketh that when he hath furnished Men with some probabilities, that may encourage them to comply with what Government shall be set up in the Church ; their interest and maintenance should resist the strength of all arguments against it for he will furnish them with no help in this ; but they must have very pliable Consciences, if Will be furnished to an opinion so maintained. His Principles in order to accommodation , or all that he will say of the Apostles Government, he draweth into 3 Propositions, p. 287. which in sum are these : ' That we cannot know what was the Apostles practice : that it was not always the same : that whatever it was, we are not obliged to observe it. Let us hear how he maketh these out.

Sett. 10. His first Proposition he setteth down thus : ' That we cannot arrive to such an absolute certainty wherein the Apostles took in governing Churches, as to infer from thence the only divine Right of that one form which the several parties imagine come nearest to it. This Proposition is not so ingenuously nor clearly set down as need were ; wherefore I shall a little remove the mist cast on the Truth by his words, which may make simple Souls mistake it. And 1. There is some ambiguity in [*absolute certainty*] if he mean so much certainty as amounteth to Plerophory and doth dispell all degrees of darkness and doubting, that we assert, not that every one may attain (such is the dark

ness of Mens minds (neither is it needful to this that we look upon what the Apostles did, as being *juris divini*. If we mean, so much certainty as doth incline the mind to the one part, and not leave it in suspense: we assert, that this may be attained in reference to what is in Question. 2. The matter in debate, is very obscurely, if not fraudulently expressed by these words [*what course the Apostles took in governing Churches*] the Question is not, whether we can know every thing that they did in this, (for many particulars are comprehended in this general expression) but whether we can know if the settled Presbyters acting in Parity, or Bishops acting with authority over Presbyters; as the ordinary Officers of the Church. 3. It is not fair dealing to imply (as this Proposition doth) that we infer the only divine Right of one form from bare Apostolical practice: he knows that we walk upon other grounds, *viz.* we take Christs command of imitating the Apostles: the Parity between our case and theirs, which may make the morality of our practice to be the same with theirs. 4. It is not the one form which several parties imagine to come nearest to Apostolical practice: but that which is proved to be really the same with it, we plead for: it's not mans imaginations, but Scriptural grounds which we establish that correspondency upon, we are asserting between Apostolical practice, and what we would have to be now in the Church. The antithesis then which we maintain against this his Proposition, is this, ' That they who search the Scripture may come to be satisfied on good grounds, whether the Apostles in planting Churches did settle Presbyters acting in Parity, or Bishops ruling over Presbyters as their ordinary Officers: so as they may (considering the duty laid on us to follow them, and the parity of our case with theirs) infer the divine Right of that one Form (of these two) which was used by the Apostles. For proof of this our antithesis I refer to the consideration laid down, p. 184, 185. about the perfection of Scripture-history, and its design to instruct us in this point: which doth so far prevail with me, that I look upon the Authors Proposition as such a reflexion on

Scripture, that any but a Papist may be ashamed of. To this I add, that the arguments brought for Presbyterial Government by the Assertors of it, do evidently destroy the Authors Proposition, and do establish our Antithesis: which seeing he doth not intend nor endeavour to answer, we need not insist upon. A further confirmation of our Antithesis shall be to take off the arguments that he hath brought for his Proposition, which I now come to.

Sect. 11. His first argument is, p. 287. from the equivalence of the names and doubtfulness of their signification, from which the form of Government used in the new Testament, should be determined. He saith, That it is hotly pleaded on both sides, that the form of Government must be derived from the importance of the names [Bishop and Presbyter] and that there can be no way to come to a determination what the certain sense of these names is in Scripture. He maketh out the uncertainty, by laying down four opinions about the signification of these names and from this variety of interpretation, inferreth that we cannot know what sense they are to be taken in. *Ans. 1.* when he saith that it is pleaded on both sides, that the form of Government must be derived from the names of Bishop and Presbyter; this is a misrepresentation; for 1. There be arguments from which it might well be derived, though these names should never be mentioned. 2. When we dispute from these Names, it is not from the bare force of the word; but from this, that the Scripture doth often apply these names to the same thing, never to divers Officers in the Church: and therefore, there is no ground for asserting the difference of Bishop and Presbyter. This is a surer argument, than what can be drawn from the importance of Names. *Ans. 2.* It is most false and injurious to the Spirit of God speaking in his word, to say, that there can be no way to determine what is the certain sense of these names in Scripture. We must then say, that the Spirit of God speaketh that which cannot be understood, if he use names and words to express some thing to us, and it is impossible to know what is meant by them. When we hear of Bi-

shop

Bishops and Presbyters in any place of Scripture : either we must say, that these words signifie nothing, or that they mean somewhat, but no man can know what it is, or that we may come to know what is meant by them. The former two are foul reflexions on the Author of holy Scripture : yea, it were a reflexion on a Man to speak or write (in a Book designed for instruction) that which either hath no meaning, or such as cannot be known. The 3d, contradicteth our Authors Assertion. His proof of the uncertainty of the signification of these Names, we have met with before in the like case : it is a most unhappy and inconsequential reason ; Men have divers ways understood these words of the Holy Ghost, *Ergo*, they cannot be understood at all. They must have a meaning, and it is our duty to search it out, however Men differ about it. There are better Reasons brought by Presbyterians, to prove that these two Names signifie the same thing ; which was incumbent on this Author to answer, and not to shift the matter with saying, that other Men think otherwise. I shall give but this instance, or hint, which may satisfy any what is the meaning of these words in Scripture. *Tit. 2.* The Apostle leaveth in *Crete Titus* to ordain Elders or Presbyters, *verse 5.* and telleth him how they must be qualified, *verse 6* and giveth this reason, why they must have such qualifications, *verse 7.* For a Bishop must be blameless : If a Bishop were another thing than a Presbyter, to what purpose were this reason here brought ? *Ergo*, they are one and the same thing. And if any affirm, that these words signifie different things in any place of Scripture, let him prove it, and we shall yield to the cause. I might also shew, that the same Office and work is every where in Scripture laid on both these ; and that never any thing is given to the one, but what is given to the other : but this hath been done, and other arguments managed fully by our Writers against Episcopacy ; neither hath *Mr. Stilling.* had the confidence to answer them, though destroying this his Assertion, and therefore I shall supersede this labour. For the name of [*Angels of the Churches*] the argument brought from it is not ours, but our opposites.

Sett. 12. His 2d. Argument for the uncertainty of Apostolical practice, p. 290. is, 'That the places of Scripture most in controversie about the form of Government, may be without any incongruity understood of either of the different Forms, which he maketh out by going through the several places. The first is, *Acts* 11. 30. where it is said, 'That the relief for the Brethren of *Judea* was sent to the Elders. There is nothing here, saith he, to shew whether there were the local Elders of *Jerusalem*, or the Bishops of the several Churches of *Judea*. *Ans.* I wonder why he should have brought this as the first, or as one of these few Scriptures that he undertaketh to answer (for, the most part of the most pungent Scriptures against his design, he doth not so much as mention) for I think it is very little insisted on by either party: nor can I remember that I have met with it, as brought to prove either Parity or imparity. Yet I do not doubt but at least some probability may be hence brought, that the Apostolical Churches were governed by the Parity of Elders; for which I lay down briefly these grounds, First, The Elders here spoken of, are the Governors of the Church; this he doth not deny. 2dly, They were the Governors of the Church of *Jerusalem*. This he saith, is not sure, for they might be the Bishops of the Churches of *Judea*. But against this I argue 1. It is not enough to say, they might be; but what ground is there to think that they were the Bishops of *Judea*, we bring probable grounds for what we assert; but what can be said for the contrary? It is a bold way of expounding Scripture, to say such a sense it may have when there is no ground to think that it hath such a sense; but some ground to the contrary. 2. However, the Relief ought to be sent to all the Churches of *Judea*, yet it is delivered at *Jerusalem* to be sent abroad: for it is delivered to these Elders by *Barnabas* and *Paul*; whom it is not like they sent through the several Churches of *Judea*: 'tis spoken of as one single act of theirs, delivering the others to a company of Elders met together. Now it is not imaginable, that all the Bishops of *Judea* were met together on this occasion: for

what needed such a Convention for receiving Alms ? Yea, we have no ground to think that it was so natural to them before-hand, as that they could meet about it. Neither hath that conceit of some, any probability ; that these Bishops did reside at *Jerusalem* : such Men did not begin so soon to slight their particular Charge, but of this after ; These Elders then were the Elders of *Jerusalem*. 3. We find a company of Elders ordinarily at *Jerusalem*, not only *Acts* 15.6. Which might be upon the solemn occasion of the Council ; but *Act*. 21.18. That these were the Elders of *Judea* come up with their flocks to keep the Feast of *Pentecost* (as Mr. Still. gueffeth) is a most irrational conceit : for though many of the *Jews* were zealous of the Law ; shall we think that the Apostles had set Teachers over them, who were no better instructed in the Gospel than so ? And besides, these believing *Jews*, ver. 20. who are said to be zealous of the Law, can neither be proved to have been then present at *Jerusalem* ; for they might hear of *Paul's* condescendency to their Customs, though they were not there : neither that they were those of the Country of *Judea* ; they might be of *Jerusalem* it self : but I incline rather to the first. Now we find not any other company of all the Elders of *Judea* met in one place : these were then the Elders of *Jerusalem*. 4. It is then observed, both by the ordinary gloss, and by *Lyra* in loc. That this famine was mainly like to be in *Jerusalem* : the Believers there being spoiled of their movable goods in the persecution about *Stephen* ; and therefore this Relief was chiefly to them : *Ergo*, they are the Elders of *Jerusalem*, which here received it. Now from these grounds it easily followeth what we intend, viz. If there was a company of Elders who were Rulers of the Church at *Jerusalem* : then this Church (of the rest there is the same reason) was not governed by a Bishop, but by Presbyters acting in Parity. It is strange, if the Elders of the Church should be spoken of, and no notice taken of My Lord Bishop (if there were any such person) in such a matter.

Señ. 13. The 2d place is *Act*. 14. 23, ' when they had ordained them Elders in every Church, to which he join-

'eth the 3^d, *Tit.* 1. 5. that thou shouldest ordain Elders in
 'every City. Of which places he saith that κατ' ἐκκλη-
 'σίαν and κατὰ πόλιν signifie no more but *Ecclesiastim*
 'and *oppidatim*; so that the places may well be understood
 'of ordaining one Elder in every Church and City, or of
 'more, but doth not determine whether one or more were
 'ordained in them. But granting all that he alledgeth, a
 strong Argument for our purpose may be brought from
 these places, thus : there was at least in every Church one
 Elder, in the Apostles times, and such an Elder as was also
 a Bishop and had governing Power over the Church, as ap-
 pareth by comparing *vers.* 7. of *Tit.* 2. with this *vers.* 5.
 But there could not be in every Church a Diocesan Bishop
 ruling over Presbyters : for one of these are over many
 Churches, *Ergo*. The Church was then governed by the
 Elders of the several Churches acting in Parity : for if eve-
 ry Church had its Elder, or Elders, and these all were Ru-
 lers, then the Rule was not in the hand of one Superiour
 over many Churches. Nothing can be questioned in this
 Argument, except it be said that every Church here is not
 every congregational but Diocesan Church. But this can
 in no wise be, for there was a necessity of an Elder or El-
 ders in every Congregational Church for the Peoples In-
 struction : if these then did rule, the Church was ruled by
 the Elders of Congregational Churches. 'The next place
 'is *Act.* 20. 17. And from *Miletus* Paul sent and called
 'the Elders of the Church. These, say we, were Elders of
 the Church of *Ephesus*, to whom in common Paul commit-
 teth the ruling of the Church, *vers.* 28. not to one Bishop
 over the rest, so that Church was governed by Parity of
 Elders. To this place he answereth by shewing some Proba-
 bilities for both meanings, *viz.* That these were the Elders
 of *Ephesus* ; and that they were the Bishops of *Asia* : but
 taketh no pains to Answer what is said on either hand, only
 concludeth, that because there is probability on both hands
 there is no fixed truth on either ; which is most detestable
 Scepticism : for if there be Arguments for both parts, sure
 both

Elders in both cannot be true, seeing they are contradictory, neither can both be false for the same reason, for *contradictoriarum altera semper est vera, altera semper est falsa*: then it was his part either to shew that neither of the arguments prove any thing, by answering to them, or to hold to the one as true, and not to hang between two. But I prove that these Elders were the Elders of *Ephesus*, not the Bishops of *Asia*. 1. (which Argument he mentioneth but he answereth not) the Article in the *Greek* maketh it clear, it being demonstratively doth apply his Speech to the Church which he had mentioned in particular: where when it's said that he sent to *Ephesus* and called for the Elders, τῆς ἐκκλησίας it might well be translated [of that Church:] it pointeth out that Church and no other. It is an unheard of way of speaking when a particular thing or person is mentioned, and the demonstrative Article joined to it, that that Speech should be understood of any other but that. 2. *Paul* sent to *Ephesus* for these Elders, not through the several parts of *Asia*. *Ergo*. They were at *Ephesus* not in other Churches. That he did not send through other places to gather them together is evident both because the Text mentioneth sending to *Ephesus*, not other places; and it is strange if he sent through all *Asia* and mention be only made of sending to one place not to any other: also because *Paul* was then in haste passing by them *vers.* 16. wherefore 'tis not like that he could stay for the convening of a Synod of Bishops from many remote parts. That which is alledged by some, that the Bishops of *Asia* did reside at *Ephesus*, and thence were sent for by *Paul*, is most absurd; for 1. There is not the least shadow of reason to think that non residence of fixed Officers did so soon creep into the Church. Let us see any Instance or Warrant to think that any who had a fixed charge did leave it long, or often, or at all, but upon some weighty and extraordinary emergent. 2. What could be their business at *Ephesus*: their work lay elsewhere, and there they could do nothing except to meet and consult about matters of common concernment: which will not infer ordinary residence there. 3. The work of these Elders was

was particular inspection over their Flocks ; vers. 28. [over all the Flock] which they could not have if they resided at *Ephesus*, and had their charges lying up and down *Asia*, for that probability which he bringeth for the contrary, it is none at all, viz. 'It is said vers. 18. That he had been with them 'at all Seasons ; but he was not all the time in *Ephesus*, but 'abroad in *Asia* as *Act.* 19. 10, 22, 26. *Ans.* [at all Seasons] must not be taken in such rigour as if he had never stirr'd a Foot out of *Ephesus* ; but that he had his residence and Preached most there, which is evident from *Act.* 19. 1, 9, 10. he disputed daily in the School of *Tyrannus* ; this was at *Ephesus* : and it is said that it continued 2 years, i. e. for the most part of the time he was there, and yet might sometimes Preach elsewhere. For the humane Testimonies he bringeth for either part, I were then in the same ballance with him and shall be content to lay no stress upon them. As for the *1 Tim.* 3. 1. which is his other place, we make no Argument from it, but maintain that it speaketh not of a Diocesan Bishop : let them who assert the contrary prove it. 'His discourse p. 293. is a very unsavory comparing 'of some Philosophical Problems which cannot well be determined (and therefore we may hesitate about them) with points of truth revealed in Scripture ; as if we might all be Sceptick in these. But sure the Comparison is miserably lame, for 1. These do not concerne our Faith or duty as these other do, and therefore there is much less hazard in Scepticism about the one than the other. 2. Even in those points the motion of the Earth or Heaven, the Flux and Reflux of the Sea, there is some truth in them, though men through darkness cannot see it : neither must we say that nothing there is, because there is nothing certain to us in these things ; or that men may impose on our belief what they please in them : hence men are the more studious in searching out these Secrets and give them not over as being destitute of all objective truth. But he dealeth worse with the things of Church-Government ; he will have no objective truth in it, and no duty to lye on us in searching out the truth, but that we must believe what men say

of it. For conclusion of what I would say to this ground
 his Scepticism about Church-Government, I will but
 mention several Scriptures, on which the truth in this is
 built *viz.* That the Apostolick form was parity, which Mr.
 hath not so much as touched: neither need I insist
 on them, seeing Arguments from them are established by
 our writers, and not enervated by him. One place is 1
Tim. 4. 14. where *Tim.* is said to be ordained by a Presby-
 ter or company of Elders joining with *Paul* in that Acti-
 on: this could not have been if Elders had not had a Parity
 Power. Another is, 1 *Cor.* 5. 4. 5. where excommuni-
 cation is transacted by the Authority of a Community, not
 of a single Person: and so is the relaxing of that Sentence
Cor. 2. 8. 10. Also 1 *Thess.* 5. 12. They who ruled that
 Church, who were over them, and must be obeyed, were nu-
 merous; not one Person: yea that work and the work of la-
 bouring among the People and admonishing them are made
 to be the business of the same Persons; which is a demon-
 stration that the Presbyters of that Church did rule in com-
 mon and not a Bishop over them. *Heb.* 13. 7, 17. proveth
 to the same thing most clearly. Other places might be
 brought, but these Instances may shew that Mr. *Stilling.* un-
 dertaking to shew that no place in Scripture determineth
 what was the Form of Government in the Apostolick
 Church, doth not touch the most considerable places com-
 monly brought to that purpose: but hath mentioned a few,
 and those which are least insisted on by them whom he oppo-
 seth; and even to them he hath said nothing to scare any
 from using them as Arguments afterward. His third Ar-
 gument for the uncertainty of the Primitive or Apostoli-
 cal Form of Government, taken from the insufficiency of
 the Testimony of Antiquity, is this; I pass it, because we
 have ground enough for the certainty of it from Scripture,
 and what he saith proveth no more but that antiquity is
 not sufficient to bear witness to it: also because all or most
 that he there discourseth proveth that it cannot be gathered
 from ancient records that Episcopacy was the Apostolical
 Form, which we willingly yield.

See.

Scd. 14. I come then to his 2^d proposition mentioned before, which he layeth down p. 322. Thus, 'That the 'Apostles in probability did not observe any one fixed course 'of settling the Government of Churches; but settled it 'according to the several circumstances of places and Persons which they had to deal with. This assertion he layeth down *ex abundanti*, not as a Foundation of his opinion on but a doctrine of probability, which may tend to compose differences about Church-Government. To clear our way in this dispute with him, let it be observed, 1. That the question being only about Parity and Imparity of Pastors all other differencies in Apostolick practices that may be alledged are impertinent to this purpose. 2. It helpeth not him, nor harmeth our cause, if we should grant, that the Apostles did in some extraordinary cases vary from their ordinary course: for it is what they did ordinarily, and where no extraordinary cause moved them to do otherwise that we inquire about. 3. Our question is not about the Government of the Church that was for a time exercised by extraordinary Officers immediately sent of God: but what was the way the Apostles settled that the Church should be governed in by her Ordinary and abiding Officers. Wherefore it maketh nothing for his purpose if it be made out that the Church was some times governed one way by extraordinary Officers, at other times or places another way by ordinary Officers. Taking these considerations along with us, I come to hear the Proofs of this his proposition. The first is taken p. 323. from the different state, condition and quantity of the Churches planted by the Apostles, and here he premiseth 3 things, *viz.* 'That 'God did not give the Apostles equal success of their Labours 'in all places, that a small number of believers did not require the same number of Officers to Teach and Govern them that a greater Church did. 3. That the Apostles did 'settle Church-Officers according to the probability of increase of Believers, and in order thereto, in some great places. About these I shall not controvert with him; only the 2^d must be understood with this distinction, else we cannot

not grant it; that a fewer number, if formed into a Church-society, though it did not need as great a number of Officers of every kind, as Teachers, Elders, Deacons; yet would it need as many sorts of Officers; and the reason is because all those acts are needful to be done to them which must be done to greater Congregations: they must be taught, ruled, and their Poor cared for; and therefore they must not want any of these sorts of Officers whose work these acts were: I mean where such Officers could be had: for Christ's institutions tie not to impossibilities. From these Premises he inferreth these two conclusions to make out his proposition; the first is p. 325. 'That in Churches consisting of a small number of believers where there was no great probability of Increase afterwards, one single Pastor with Deacons under him were only constituted by the Apostles for the ruling of these Churches. On this conclusion (before I come to his Proofs of it) I shall make these remarques. 1: Here is nothing here for the Imparity of Presbyters, or the Authority of a Bishop over Presbyters; if where more Presbyters could not be had, one was to do the work, this doth not at all say that the Apostles ever did, or that we may set one over the rest, where many may be had to rule the Church. This conclusion then proveth nothing. 2. These Deacons that here he speaketh of either had ruling power or not: if he say the first I doubt, if he can prove that ever any such Deacons were in the Apostolick Churches, where the Deacons work was to serve, not to rule that Church: and if they had ruling power they were not only Deacons but ruling Elders, both works being laid on the same Persons for want of men to exercise them distinctly; which saith nothing against Presbyterians. If the second, first question if any instance can be given of a Church so constituted by the Apostles. 2. If it was so, it was necessity, not choice that made them be without ruling Elders.

Señ. 15. But how proveth he this his conclusion? by four Testimonies out of Clement, *Epiph.* and others. What? hath he so soon forgot himself? he had immediately before spent about 30 pages in proving that the Testimony of

of the Fathers is not sufficient to prove what was the Apostles Practice; and that by making out the defectiveness, ambiguity, partiality and repugnancy of the Records of the succeeding Ages: it is strange then that to prove this his Assertion concerning Apostolick Practice, he should bring no other Argument at all but such as he had set that *Nigra Theta* upon. Neither see I what those Testimonies prove contrary to us. The Testimony of *Clement* saith no more than what is implied, *Phil.* 1. 1. That the Apostles ordained Bishops and Deacons: and our Author himself maintaineth that those were not by their constitution any more than Presbyters: whatever they might after get by mens Institution proveth not what was Apostolick constitution. For the Testimony of *Epiphanius* he confesseth its intricacie and obscurity, and therefore (by his own Argument, of which before) it is not to be laid weight upon: but he taketh great deal of pains to explain it and make it speak this sum: 'that at first there were only Bishops and Deacons' (by Bishops he meaneth Presbyters, as appears from his Subjoyning immediately that there was necessity for Presbyters and Deacons) and that by these all Ecclesiastical Offices might be performed: but afterward where there was need and there were found any worthy of it, there was a Bishop appointed: but where there were not many to be Presbyters; they were content with a Bishop and Deacons. Here are 3 cases; Presbyters and Deacons; Bishop and Deacons; this in case of necessity where more Presbyters could not be had: this Bishop, as hath been shewn before, could be nothing above a Presbyter; none of those cross our design: for the third, viz. a Bishop set over Presbyters, first *Epiphanius* doth not say it was so appointed by the Apostles, but [it was done] it is like he meant by succeeding Ages. 2. He doth not say that this Bishop was set over Presbyters with jurisdiction; he might as well say merely a *præses*, so there is nothing here to prove that the Apostles ever settled any thing contrary to Parity of Presbyters. The Testimony out of *Clem. Alexan.* even what *Salmasius* his commentary proveth no more but that

Some places were more Presbyters, in some fewer, in some but one. His last Testimony saith nothing at all to the purpose: only that the Apostles settled things by degrees, not that ever they set up Bishops.

Seet. 16. The 2d Conclusion that he inferreth, p. 332.

That in Churches consisting of a multitude of Believers, or where there was a probability of a great increase by preaching the Gospel, the Apostles did settle a College of Presbyters, whose Office was partly to govern the Church already formed, and partly to labour in converting more.

This we close with, and from it, and the former Conclusion

which make up his whole Argument, infer the quite contrary to his design, *viz.* That the Apostles kept a most uni-

form course, (so far as necessity did permit) in settling the

Government of Churches: and that they settled the Govern-

ment in the hands of Presbyters acting in a Society where

they could be had, and singly where more could not be:

and that they never settled it in the hand of a Bishop Ru-

ling over Presbyters. All this is evident from what hath been

said. He taketh occasion, p. 336, &c. to speak against the

Office of Ruling-Elders in the Church: in which Dispute

he toucheth not any (except one Scripture) of those argu-

ments which are brought by the Defenders of that Office:

which is but a slight way of disputing against any Opinion.

It is not needful to our Design to handle this Debate fully,

all that be answered which is written by the Author of the

Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland:

by the Author of the Treatise of Ruling-Elders and Dea-

cons: by the London Ministers in their *jus divinum Reg-*

ecles. and in their Vindication of Pres. Gov. by *Smeck.*

Calv. Just. lib. 4. c. 4. sect. 8. and lib. 4. c. 11. sect.

by Peter Martyr, Loc. com. clas. 4. c. 1. num. 11. and

many others. Wherefore I shall only answer what this

Author hath said against the Truth in this Point. Whereas

among many other Scriptures proving this Office, 1 *Tim. 5.*

7. is brought as one, there being implied there a distinc-

tion of Elders that Rule well, and are to be honoured

with double Honour, into such as labour in the Word and

Doctrine,

Doctrine, and another member of the distinction not ex-
 pressed, which can be none else but Elders who rule and do
 not labour in the Word and Doctrine, *i. e.* whose Office it
 is only to Rule, not to Teach publicly, as Pastors. Of this
 Scripture he pretendeth to bring a full, clear and easie un-
 derstanding, *viz.* ' That of the Elders that were ordained
 ' in great Churches, (who had power to discharge all Pa-
 ' storal acts, but did not all attend equally the same part of
 ' the work) some did most attend the Ruling of the Flock
 ' already converted ; others laboured most in converting
 ' others by Preaching ; and that according to their sever-
 ' abilities : now these last deserved greater Honour, both
 ' because their burthen was greater, and their sufferings
 ' more. This is no new, though it be a false interpreta-
 ' on : for the Author of *Affer. Govern. Ch. of Scol.* p. 48,
 46. bringeth it as one of Dr. *Fields* Answers to the same
 place : or rather two of them which by our Author are put
 together. But against this exposition of the Text, I thus
 argue : 1. This Gloss supposeth that there were Elders,
 whose Office it was to Teach and to Rule : and yet they
 did ordinarily neglect the one part of this their work, and
 contented themselves with doing the other : Is it imaginable
 that the Lord allows any Honour at all upon such ? and
 yet the Text alloweth double Honour, even on unpreaching
 Elders, though the Preachers have it more especially. This
 Reason is strongly enforced, if we consider that Church
 Power communicated by Christ to the Officers of his house
 is not only a Licence or Permission (as we noted before)
 but a charge of which they must give an account : as it is
 said of Church-rulers *Heb. 13. 17.* Neither do I see how
 any who by their Office are Preachers of the Gospel, can
 free themselves of that wherewith the Apostle chargeth him-
 self, *1 Cor. 9. 16.* Necessity is laid upon me, yea wo is un-
 to me if I Preach not the Gospel ; and of that charge laid on
Timothy (who was as much taken up with ruling as any)
2 Tim. 4. 2. that he should Preach the word, be instant in
 Season, out of Season : May men when Christ hath put
 them in Office and given them a charge ; choose what part

of the work of that Office and Charge they will do, and
 what not? But I perceive, this Man's principles lead him to
 subject all Christs Institutions to Mens will, to cut and carve
 of them as they please: Christ hath given Pastors a charge
 that they should Teach and Rule his Church. He had
 pleaded before the Ruling-power may be taken from some,
 and laid on others; now he affirmeth the same of Teach-
 ing-power: this is intolerable boldness. 2. We have no
 better ground for judging of the diversity of Officers in
 the Church, than by considering divers sorts of work which
 some did ordinarily with the Lord's approbation, that o-
 thers did not, but were employed in other work. What
 better Note can we have to know what is a Mans Office;
 than his work which he is ordinarily employed in, and that
 with God's own approbation? Wherefore, if some Elders
 Preached, others preached not, but Ruled; we must think
 that these were distinct Officers, and that their Office led them
 only to do what they did. 3. This learned Author should
 have brought some reason for what he alledged, viz. That
 these unpreaching Elders, who Ruled, had power to preach;
 αὐτοὶ ἐφη, shall not persuade us of it: neither is there
 the least shew of warrant for such an Assertion. If it be said
 that they preached sometimes, and therefore could not be
 without Preaching-power. *Answer.* It cannot be proved that
 there were any Officers in the Apostolick Church, who had
 Preaching-power, or did sometimes Preach, and yet were
 so taken up with Ruling, that they did not ordinarily
 Preach. 4. We may with as much (yea the same) reason say,
 That every Officer in the Church had all Church-power,
 and might occasionally exert it; though some according
 to their gift did ordinarily exert one part; others, another:
 and that Deacons might preach, and do all the work of
 the Pastors, though ordinarily, being better gifted for that,
 they served Tables: but this is to jumble together what the
 Lord hath made an ordinary separation of. 5. This Opi-
 nion maketh the different work that Church-Officers are
 employed in, not to proceed from distinct Office or Power,
 but from different gifts, which would bring a Babel of con-
 fusion

fusion into the Church ; For 1. As Men think they are gifted, so will they take up their Work; and so most will readily incline to the easiest work, and think their gift lieth that way, to the great neglect of the difficult and main business and because Ruling is sweet to an ambitious mind, and laborious preaching is painful ; we shall have abundance of Rulers, but few Teachers. 2. By the same reason one may neglect all the parts of his work, that he may neglect one : pretending that his gift is not for this, nor for that, and that they may be done by others. If it must be said the Church must appoint them their work, and not leave it to their choice. *Ans^r.* If the Church appoint Timothy work to be to Rule, and exempt him from preaching ordinarily ; I see not how he differeth from the Ruling-Elders, which this Author disputeth against, notwithstanding his supposed power to Preach ; which to him is an idle Talent (I mean, if this be done warrantably : otherwise it is not done) especially, if the Church give him no more power than Christ hath given to every Pastor, that is, to Rule over the flock with the equal concurrence of his fellow Presbyters ; not to rule over Presbyters by himself singly for that they cannot give him this Power. I have before proved. 6. If the Elders that preach, because of the greatness of their work and sufferings, have more honour than they who only Rule ; then the Bishop being of this last sort must be inferiour in honour to those other Presbyters : especially this must hold in the opinion of this Author, who holdeth, That Bishop and Presbyter differ not *jure divino* but this I suppose will not well please his Lordship and indeed is very unsuitable to the dignity of one who Ruleth over others : sure the dignity of Church-Officers is to be reckoned by the dignity of their place ; where it is different : as it is by the discharge of their work when their place is the same.

Scilicet. 17. To strengthen this his Conceit, he brings testimony out of *Chrysost.* affirming, that the *ποίμενες* & *διδάσκαλοι*, the fixed Officers of particular Churches, 'who were *κατὰ κόμης* & *πολεῖς ἀφορισμένοι*, were

'infe-

inferiour to them, who preaching the Gospel, travelled abroad into divers places. *Ans.* This is not at all to the purpose: for they who so travelled abroad, were Evangelists; no fixed Officers: but of the former, the Apostle doth not at all speak here; 'It rather appeareth (saith the Author, *Affer. 1. Gover. Ch. Scotl.*) that Elders were ordained in every City, there to abide with their particular charges, *Acts 14. 23. Tit. 1. 5.* He argueth also thus against Ruling-Elders: 'These Elders are not the Bishops Paul speaketh of, *1 Tim. 3.* For these must be διδασκαλοι, *verse 2. 1.* *Ans.* The Author now cited, answereth this Argument brought by Dr. Field; and citeth Beza, answering to Sarau. who had used it. Passing his first Answer, I make use of the 2d, which is Beza's; That the Ruling-Elder, though he ought not to Teach publickly as a Pastor, yet he ought to Teach privately, and occasionally, according as the need of every one requireth: it is his part to oversee the manners of the people, and to bring miscarriages to the Church, to be censur'd; but first he is to labour to reclaim the Offender by private admonition, according to Christ's Rule, *Matth. 18. 15, 16, 17.* and that not only *ex charitate*, as every Christian ought to do; but *virtute Officii* and authoritatively: and for this cause he ought to be a Man of Understanding above the common sort, both able and willing to Teach (so the word beareth) so far as his place requireth. Again, he argueth from *Act. 20. 28.* 'All the Elders of Ephesus had a Pastoral charge, for they are bid take heed to the Flock as Overseers: but this is inconsistent with the Notion of a Lay-Elder, *Ergo*, there were none such at Ephesus. *Ans.* The Major is false: they had a charge and oversight: but every oversight is not Pastoral. Ruling also falleth under this Notion, which is the Office of the Elder we plead for. He confesseth, p. 338. the weakness of that argument from Maintenance, which he saith brought Blondel quite off from Ruling-Elders, in that place of *1 Tim. 5. 17.* It is true, Blondel de jur. Pleb. in Reg. Eccl. p. 77, &c. alledgeth, That these Elders are not there meant, because Maintenance

'nance. (Implied in double Honour, as is clear from ver. 18
 'compared) is due to these, but not to Ruling-Elders.
 Yet the Argument, with all the enforcements of that learn-
 ed Author, will not prove what he designeth. For 1. Some
 famous Interpreters understand this double Honour, only
 of a degree of Honour beyond these spoken of before, viz.
 Widows, so *Calv.* in *loc.* 2. How shall it be proved, that
 Maintenance is not due to Ruling-Elders, or the *seniores*
plebis, as *Blondel* calleth them? His arguments taken from
 the disuse of it, will not conclude this: neither what
 he saith of the want of Power in any to remit it: for
 where it cannot be had for them, necessity excuseth the
 withholding of it: where it cannot be had, let the Inhaun-
 ders of Church-Rents answer for it, if such necessities be
 not supplied to the Church: neither do I blame him for
 blaming (p. 83.) these Protestant Nations, who have call-
 ed out Abbacies which abounded in Riches, have rather taken
 the Revenues into the State-Treasury, than allowed it for
 such good Uses as this. I add for further answer out of
Affer. Gover. Ch. Scotl. p. 105. That a stipend, though due
 is not essential to the Office, either of Elders or Ministers,
 and therefore the want of the one, can be no argument a-
 gainst the other; But neither is *Blondel* against the Office
 of Ruling-Elders (though he deny them to be spoken of
 in *1 Tim.* 5. 17. but disputeth strongly for it, yea, and
 groundeth it on the Apostles practice, p. 85, which is an e-
 vidence of Divine Right. The next thing *Mr. Stilling.* saith
 against Ruling-Elders, is, 'That if we remove from the
 'Scripture to the Primitive Church, we shall find the great-
 'est difficulty to trace the footsteps of a Lay-Elder through-
 'the Records of Authority for the first 3 Centuries especi-
 'ally. *Ans.* 1. We look on the Scripture as a surer Word
 of Prophecy, and therefore are unwilling to pass from it, to
 that which *Mr. Stilling.* hath above proved, to be utterly so
 insufficient to determine in matters of Church-Government.
 2. Others are of another mind than this Author. *Blondel de*
jur. pleb. in Reg. Eccl. p. 85. 'aliis igitur, saith he, firmamentum,
 'in nimirum, qui nobis Apostolorum primamque per trium se-
 'culorum

culorum periodum antiquitatis, praxin stravit, seniorum plebis
 Institutio & functio (ut sic dicam) vite à protestantibus
 per Gallias, Scotiam, Belgiam instituta statuminanda est.
 And Affir. Grov. Ch. Scot. par. 1. c. 8, 9. Unpregnable
 and abundant Testimonies out of Antiquity are brought for
 this Office, which seeing Mr. Stilling. hath not Answered,
 it is needless to insist on them. 3. But, and if in many
 places in the Primitive times this Office was disused, it
 was their fault, and taken notice of by the better sort.
 Calp. in 1 Tim. 5. 17. speaking of this Office, saith, 'Hunc
 morem Ambrosius absolevisse conqueritur doctorum Ignavia, vel
 potius superbia dum soli volunt eminere. See Testimonies
 for the Antiquity of it. Smeēt. sect. 15.

Sect. 18. His second proof of his second Propositi-
 on, viz. That the Apostles took diverse courses in Ruling
 Churches, is p. 342. 'from the multitude of unfixed Of-
 ficers residing in some places, who managed the affairs
 of the Church in chief, during their residence: such were
 Apostles and Evangelists. In some places, saith he, these
 were, others not, and in some places no Officers but these.
 Answ. This is obviated by our 3d Observ. For the Que-
 stion is only about Government by ordinary and abiding
 Officers, and that only where they could be had, of whom
 this proof doth not speak. His 3d Proof, *ibid.* 'is from
 the different customs observed in the Church after the A-
 postles times. This is most inconsequent: yea, one might
 as well reason thus: In after-times they set up Metropoli-
 tans; and at last a Pope, Ergo, it was so in the Apostles
 times. We say then, That diversity in after Ages flowed
 from this; that Men (following Mr. Stilling. Principles)
 did not follow divine Institution, or Apostolick practice,
 but their own Wit and Reason. Beside, the diversities he
 here instanceth in, are not to the purpose; for he doth not
 shew us that Parity was in one place, and imparity in ano-
 ther; but that in one place the Presbyters chused their Bi-
 shop, in another not.

Sect. 19. We come at last to his 3d proposition about
 Apostolick practice p. 341. viz. 'That a meer Apostolical

' practice being supposed, is not sufficient of it self for the
 ' founding of an unalterable and perpetual Rite for the Form
 ' of Government in the Church which is supposed to be
 ' founded on that Practice. This doctrine he laid down
 before *par 1 c. 1. p. 23.* And we examined *p.* where
 I stated that question far otherwise than he seemeth here to
 do, and indeed this proposition, as here laid down, might be
 yielded by us: neither doth it nor his Arguments for it
 touch the controversie, which is *and abatarum more pugnare*
 We lay no obligation on any by a meer Apostolical Pra-
 ctice; but by their Practice considered as done in the same
 case that we are in. Neither 2. do we say that such pra-
 ctice is sufficient of it self to bind us, for it hath Gods com-
 mand of Imitation, of which before; and equal Morality of
 that action to us and then to concur with it in this. Nei-
 ther do we say. 3. That their Practice doth found a Rite
 it doth but declare what is founded on the will of Christ
 as that which we must do. Most of all his Arguments are
 obviated by what is already said. ' The first, that they did
 ' many things without intention of obliging others, as go-
 ' ing abroad to Preach the Gospel unprovided; *Pauls* not
 taking wages &c. This doth not touch the point, seeing
 these things were for a peculiar reason. To the same pur-
 pose is the 2d Argument *p. 343.* (which indeed is but the
 same Argument) that they did many things on particular
 ' occasions, emergencies and circumstances; as *Pauls* celebrate
 ' Community of goods, Preaching in private Houses, Fields,
 &c. That which only is worth the noticing in this Argu-
 ment is *p. 344.* ' That he requireth, before Apostolical
 ' Practice be obligations, that it be made appear, that what
 ' they did was not according as they saw reason depend-
 ' ing on the several circumstances of Time, place and per-
 ' sons, but from some unalterable Law of Christ. *Answer.*
 This we are able to prove, as to ruling the Churches by a
 Parity of Elders, for they did ordinarily so practice, and
 that where the place, persons and times were not the same:
 neither can it be shewed that ever they did otherwise. *i. e.*
 set up a Bishop over Presbyters: is not this sufficient ground
 to

to think that they did this not occasionally but by a Law of Christ? His 3^d Argument, is 'That the Office of Deaconesses is of Apostolick practice: and yet now laid aside as not binding. *Answer.* 1. It is the opinion of some Learned men, as *Peter Martyr Loc. Com. clas. 4. c. 1. num. 11.* and the Author of *Affer. Gov. Ch. Scot. par. 1. c. 5. p. 38* (who citeth also *Aretius*) that though women might be taken into that part of the Office of the Deacon that concerneth caring for the Sick; yet men also might exercise it: which is gathered from *Ro. 12. 8. ὁ ἐλεῶν* he that sheweth mercy, and *1 Tim. 5. 8. εἰ δὲ τις* though Widows be there spoken of, yet the best interpreters turn these words in the masculine gender; and our translation thus, If any provide not for his own House; which they would not do if they thought that Widows only were they to whom that Office belonged. 2. Supposing them to be used in the Apostolick Church, there may be a peculiar reason for it: in those times of persecution many were strangers, others cast off by their Parents and Friends for the profession of the truth: when such were sick, none could so well attend them as women: the case is not so now: and if it were, sure this example might shew us our Duty. 4. If it can be proved to have been the constant Use of Apostolick Churches, and that with out such extraordinary necessity; then the neglect of it is a great defect in the Church. 'His fourth Argument is, that some Apostolick rites and Customes are out of use, *Ergo*, their example doth not bind. He instanceth dipping in Baptism, love-Feasts, community of goods, the Holy Kiss. *Answer.* We deny the antecedent, being understood of Customes not built on a reason peculiar to them. His Instances prove nothing, dipping cannot be proved to have been only used, and if it were; to us it is not false, because of the coldness of our Climate. We deny the love-Feasts to have been *Apostolical*. Yea they are expressly condemned as used in the Church *1 Cor. 11. 22.* and if they were used elsewhere, it was a Civil Custom, and so not falling in within the present debate. Kissing was the

Civil custome in Salutation; this the Apostle 1 *Thes.* 5. 26 would have them to use holily: neither can it be proved that ever it was religiously observed in the Apostolical Church. Community of goods was built on a peculiar reason, suiting those times of persecution, and so not to the purpose. Whatever can be proved to be Apostolical and falleth not under the exceptions before mentioned, we shall bear the blame if we observe them not.

CHAP. VII.

THE Medium by which he here proveth the Form of Church-Government to be indifferent, is taken from the practice of the antient Churches in Ages succeeding that of the Apostles: he taketh much pains to prove that the Primitive Church did not conceive it self obliged to observe one individual Form; 'but settled things as it judged them tend most to peace and edification, without any antecedent obligation binding to one course: and thence inferreth, that no certainty can be brought from their practice to prove one Form to be *juris divini*. We are not concerned here to enter the lists with him: it shall be sufficient to our purpose, to animadvert a few things in general. 1. It is no great matter if we yield him the conclusion, seeing we have sufficient ground to build the divine Right of Presbyterial Government upon, in Scripture; and so may spare any Argument that may be brought for it from antiquity. 2. It is no wonder that the one Primitive and Apostolical yea, divine Form of Government was not every where stuck to in after ages: seeing the ambition of many men began soon to carry them beyond the boundaries Christ had set, to devise what might best suit their own humours, rather than what was for the Churches good: the Apostle telleth us that even in his daies (which was a wonder)

der) this Mystery of iniquity had begun to work, 2 *Thes.* 2. 7. It is no wonder then, that soon after it began to appear : and when some had thus miscarried, and others stuck to the Apostolical frame of things, this might quickly breed a diversity. 3. It will easily appear to any who readeth this Chap. that all the Authours discourse tendeth to prove that the ancient Churches thought not Episcopacy to be *jure divino* : let them who are concerned answer him in this if they can ; I am convinced of the truth of what he saith. But let us take a short view of the grounds on which he establisheth what he asserteth in this Chap.

Sett. 2. The first is, ' That the extent of the Power of Church-Officers did increase meerly from the enlargement of the bounds of Churches : which he maketh out in 4 steps or periods. The first is, when Churches were the same with Christians in a whole City. And here he handleth 3 things, first he sheweth that the Primitive constitution of Churches was in a Society of Christians in the same City : ' where he will have the name [Church] in Scripture to be only given to that, not to a particuler congregation meeting in one place. I do not deny but the name is given as he saith, because of that confederacy in discipline among divers congregations in one City : yet neither the name nor the nature of a Church must be denied to a single congregation ; for a Church in Scripture-Language is a company met together to serve God : now this agreeth well to a single Congregation ; seeing in it not only word and Sacraments are administred, but also discipline is exercised, as shall anon appear. All that he saith proveth the former use of the word ; but nothing against this latter. 2. He speaketh of the Government of these Churches *p.* 352. ' And that 1. before Parishes, or distinct Congregations were settled. 2. after they were settled (about which he largely disputeth when it began, which is not to our purpose) in both cases, he saith, they were ruled in common ; and *p.* 354. That it is a weak conceit to think that after the settling of Congregations, every one had a distinct Presbytery to rule it, and *p.* 356. this crumbling saith he, of ' Church-

'Church-Power into every Congregation is a thing abso-
 'lutely disowned by the greatest and most Learned Patrons
 'of Presbytery beyond the Seas, as may be seen in *Calv.*
 'Beza, *Salmasius*, *Blondel*, *Gerson*, *Bucer* and others. I do
 readily yield to him, that it is most probable that in times
 of Persecution, particular congregations could not be soon
 settled: and that then, where there were in one City more
 Christians then could meet in one place, they were ruled
 only in Common, yea and had their meetings for worship
 occasionally as they could. Also we grant that when Con-
 gregations were settled, the several Congregations in one
 City were ruled by one common Presbytery made up of the
 Officers of them all: but that they had not their distinct
 Presbyters that ruled them severally in subordination to
 this superior Presbyters we utterly deny; and I look upon
 it as a too supercilious assertion, to call this a weak conceit.
 seeing it is well known that it hath been the Judgment of
 men with whom, for ability, I think *Mr. Still.* modesty
 will not suffer him to compare himself. But what ever be
 of the ability of them who own it; there is reason for it
 so weighty, as may excuse it from weakness; which is this
 Single Congregations meeting ordinarily together for the
 worship of God, cannot but have many affairs that do only
 concern them, not the other Churches or Congregations
 in the same City; as admission or exclusion of their mem-
 bers from the Lords Supper rebuking them, consulting about
 the time and ordering of their Administration &c. 'Tis
 very unfit to bring all these things, in *prima instantia*, to the
 Presbytery that ruleth in common. This I confirm out of
 what himself hath written, *p.* 368. He saith 'that Country
 'Churches had their own rulers who ruled them, though
 'with subordination to those in the City: is there not the
 same reason why particular Congregations, though in City
 should have their Rulers? 'tis as really inconvenient to
 bring every matter of a City-Congregation, at the first hand
 to the common Presbyters, as it is to bring the matters of
 a Country Parish to it. Yet we acknowledge that it is to
 be ordered according as it conduceth most to the good of

the Church: neither if we should yield all that he saith, is
 any thing against the Divine Right of Parity. What he
 saith of these worthy Divines disowning this Power of par-
 ticular Congregations, we have cause to suspend our belief
 of it, till he bring some testimony of their own writings to
 prove it, which he hath not so much as effaid. It is like
 they were against Independent Power of Particular Con-
 gregations; not their subordinate Power: for the Testimo-
 nies that he bringeth they prove no more than what we
 have granted, *viz.* That the Congregations were ruled in
 common: not, that they had no particular Government in
 each of them; as any may easily see by considering them.
 Neither is it any wonder that the records of Antiquity speak
 of the acts of those greater, not of the lesser and Congre-
 gational Presbyteries: seeing matters coming before the lat-
 ter were of so private concernment; such as use not often
 to be so much taken notice of. The 3^d thing he speaketh
 of in this first step of the growth of Churches, is, 'what
 Relation the Churches in several Cities had one to another,
 and to the lesser City, that were under them: and here he
 maintaineth that Metropolitans are not of Divine Right;
 to which we agree: I add, that in the first and more pure Pri-
 mitive times they had no Being at all, as is clearly made out
 by *Diocl. Altar. Damasc. c. 2.* Where he sheweth that
Justine and *Ireneus* have nothing of the different degrees of
 Bishops: and that *Cyprian* in the middle of the third Cen-
 tury doth often assert their Parity. The second step is, p.
 68. 'When Churches took in the Villages and Territo-
 ries adjoining to that Citie: he saith, that the City-Pres-
 byters did Preach in these places, and adjoined the Con-
 verts to the City-Church. till after, when they were in-
 creased in Villages they got peculiar Officers set over them,
 who did rule them, yet with subordination to the City-
 Church. This last I only dislike: neither do I see it
 proved by him, for the Titles of *matrix ecclesia, et Cathedra*
principalis signifie no more but a greater dignity and pri-
 macy of Order, not of Jurisdiction. What he saith of that
Eulogie, sending abroad consecrated pieces of bread, doth
 not

not prove the point: and also it was a superstitious custome
 the bad improvement of it appeareth in the *Papish* adorati-
 on of their *Hostia*. His next step is p. 372. 'When Chur-
 'ches did associate in one Province: where he speaketh of
 'Provincial Synods once a year, and sheweth that no Bishop
 'had power over another, but that their Honour depended
 'on their Sees. Thence he cometh to the last step, where
 'the whole World became Christians, and the Bishops of
 'Rome and Constantinople did strive for the place of Univer-
 'sal Bishop. I hope it appeareth to any who consider, that
 there is nothing yet said by him which can overturn the
 Divine Rite of Parity, even to have been maintained in
 the Primitive times (I mean not of the last step he speak-
 eth of, when Papacy it self began to appear) for all that
 hath been said sheweth that Imparity was never judged of
 necessity; and that the Imparity which was used was rather
 of Order than of Jurisdiction, which is nothing against
 the Divine Rite of that Parity we plead for.

Secd. 3. His 2d Argument p. 374. is, 'That the same
 'Form was not of old observed in all Churches: where he
 'sheweth that in many places, there were no Bishops; as he
 'proveth of *Scotland* and other places. This we accept of
 'and add, that where there were Bishops, it is not, nor can
 not be by him proved, that they had any Superior Jurisdic-
 tion, but only Precedency: and so the Divine Rite of Parity
 may stand for all this. His 3d Argument p. 377. is, 'That
 'the Government of the Church was conform to the Civil
 'Government, which he saith is insisted on by Learned Per-
 'sons on all sides; especially after the division of the Ro-
 'man Empire. And he giveth some Instances of it in the
 'correspondency of Civil Prefects and Arch-Bishops in se-
 'veral places. To all this let me say a few words. 1. This
 Argument destroyeth it self: for in the first antiquity which
 was the surest, the Powers of the World were not Christi-
 an, and so the Church could not conform to the state in
 her Offices. 2. It is here confessed, that this Conformity was
 especially (I believe it may be said only) after that division
 of the *Roman Empire*: but those were the times when the

man of Sin had almost got into his chair; and therefore their practice can prove nothing of the mind of the Primitive Church. 3. If this notion hold, then it must be looked upon as a lawful and prudent expedient, that there be one Pope as there was one Emperor. This Mr. *Still*. must maintain, or he saith nothing. 4. If this was their Rite of old, then the Church behoved to be under two chief Bishops when the Roman Emperor was divided into two. But this he doth not alledge, but rather sheweth how it was divided into 13 Diocesses. 5. If we receive this opinion, then in a Kingdome there must be one head, who must have his Council of Bishops, without a charge of the several Diocesses (for the Kings Council hath not Precedency of several parts of the Country) and they must authorize their deputies, like Sheriffs, yearly &c. And in a Common-wealth there must be Independant Government: but this I hope the Author will not own. 6. It is most unreasonable to say that the Church-Government should be conform to the Civil; because they are conversant about things and aim at ends so different: the one respecteth things that are most different in several Nations, viz. Mens Civil interest, and Customes and Inclinations: the other respecteth that which ought to be every where the same, viz. Religion. His 4. Argument p. 379. is, 'That other Episcopal Government was settled in the Church, yet Presbyterian Ordination was looked on as valid. This is not against us. His last Argument p. 382. is, 'That several restraints were laid on by Councils about the Observation of Rites and Customes and something of Church-Discipline; but what is this I pray to Parity or Imparity? we are not against determinations of Indifferent things that concern order and decency: though we think that the form of Government is determined by Christ, not left to the will of man.

CHAP. VIII.

IN this Chapter our Author would make us believe, that all the world was ever of his Opinion: and indeed this is so common for men to alledg, whatever be their singular notions of things, that we are not to lay much weight upon it. *Videli* took as much pains to make a reformed Divines to speak for *Erastianism*. I might excuse my self from meddling any further with this last Chapter of his. 1. From the needlessness of the thing; because we do not build the Divine Right of Presbytery on mens Opinions, who we know can err, and therefore all the world were against it, if the Scripture be for so must we. 2. From the disadvantage I lie under as to this part of the dispute with him. If I had been *Mr. Still*. opinion in this point in controversie, I might through compliance with courses have been furnished with a good Library and other conveniencies of studying, the want of which doth incapacitate me to search into the opinions of those worthy men which he citeth in doing whereof, I hope it would not be difficult to shew that some of their Testimonies are made to speak otherwise than they thought; and others of them are irreconcilable with what themselves have elsewhere written.

Señ. 2. Notwithstanding we shall essay briefly to answer as much to his allegations, as may take off that edge which they seem to have, for cutting asunder the cause which we maintain. P. 384. he hath a confident assertion. 'believe, saith he, there will upon the most impartial survey, scarce be one Church of the Reformation brought which doth embrace any form of Government, because it looked upon that form as only necessary to an unalterable standing Law: but every one took

that form of Government which was judged most suitable to the state and condition of the several Churches. I wonder to see this so confidently asserted, without proof. It had been incumbent on Mr. *Still*, for confirming this his dream, to have gone through the confession of the several reformed Churches; and let us see on what ground they then built their Church-Government; for it will not sufficiently prove what was the judgment of these Churches, that some eminent men in them did assert such things: which latter of the two he only insisteth on, and that to little purpose too, as I hope shall appear. But the falsehood of this Allegiance I will make appear afterwards, when I have tried the strength of the Testimonies he bringeth for his opinions.

Sec. 3. He beginneth with them who have asserted the mutability of the form of Government in *Thest* where he maketh it his chief business to shew, that the Church of *England* of old was of this opinion. To which I answer, That those worthy men having nothing in their eye but Episcopacy; their work was to oppose the Divine Right of that: there was never another form brought in competition with it, nor much minded by them: and therefore we agree with them in their design. Of Foreign Divines, his first Testimony is of *Chemnitz*: to which I cannot give a particular answer, because not having his book I cannot try it: only this consideration I shall lay down, to take off the strength of it. Neither Mr. *Still*, nor any man else ought to lay weight on this Testimony to the purpose it is brought for: for either he meaneth that the degrees of Church-Officers in respect of precedency are left free, or in respect of Jurisdiction: if the first, it is nothing contrary to what we hold, for we acknowledg it indifferent, whether there be a standing Precedent over Presbytery or not. If the second, he is directly contrary to Mr. *Stillingfleet*, who maintains, that the Church may set up no new Officers but what Christ hath instituted;

as we have seen before : now an order of Officers with jurisdiction above what Christ hath instituted, cannot but be a sort of Officers that he hath not instituted : wherefore Mr. *Still*. could not make Use of this Testimony, neither ought any else, for it crosseth the Scripture ; which (*Rom. 12. 6, 7, 8. Ephes. 11. 1. 1 Cor. 12. 28.*) doth on purpose enumerate the Officers of the Church in all their degrees. I dispute not now what they are ; but sure they are not left at liberty ; seeing the Lord hath so often declared his mind in this Point : to what purpose is it said that the Lord hath in his Church such and such Officers ; if men may at their pleasure set these or others more or fewer of them in the Church.

Señ. 4. His next Testimony is the *Centuriators of Magdeburge*, but it containeth an answer in its forehead, viz. That it speaketh not to the thing ; for they say no more but that it is neither Recorded, nor Commanded, how many Ministers should be in each Church ; but that their may be more or fewer, according to the number of the Church. What is this to their parity or impatity ? 'tis a token that he is very scant of Witnesses, when he calleth in them who say so little to his purpose. The next Testimony is of *Zanchy*, which he maketh to speak very fair for him : but he hath unhandsofly concealed that which is the Key to understand the meaning of this Author ; for the Reader may evidently see his drift, if he first look into *Señ. 9.* (*de Relig. c. 25.*) where he asserteth that Christ hath only given to his Church two sorts of ordinary Teachers, viz. Pastors and Doctors : the same he asserteth, *Señ. 10.* 'and yet (which is his modesty) he will not condemn the Fathers who had other Orders of Officers : but what his meaning is, in this his condescendency, he explaineth *Señ. 11.* That whereas in after Ages, one Pastor was set over the rest (*non ut Dominus, sed ut Rector in Academia reliquis Collegis,*) this he thinketh was lawful and yet fetch this note upon that practice in the same

' *Señ. ' Qua-de re Hieronymi tum alibi, tum in Epist.*
 ' *ad Evagr. & in Commentar. Epist. ad Tit. c. 10. Nar-*
 ' *ratio & sententia nobis probatur, dicentis totum hoc ma-*
 ' *gis ex consuetudine quam ex dominice dispositionis ve-*
 ' *ritate profectum esse.* Which is as much as to say, He
 thought it rather somewhat tolerable through neces-
 sity, than allowable. Which small glance at the to-
 lerableness of a Precedency in the Church (if it may
 pass for so much) was not well taken by other
 Worthy Divines ; as appeareth by *Zanchius's* own ob-
 servations on this his Confession (which *Mr. Stil-*
ling. taketh notice of, but passeth what might make a-
 gainst him) for ' *Magnus quidem vir,* as *Zant.* calleth
 ' him : who was well satisfied with the rest of his
 Confession, excepteth this which he had said of the
 Arch-Bishops and Hierarchie ; and that not only as
 what did displease himself, but was unfutable to the
 harmony of confessions that the Protestant Churches
 were then drawing up : as appeareth by a part of an
 Epistle of that *Magnus vir,* to *Zan.* which he insert-
 eth to the Preface to his Observations. So that it
 seems, this was generally disliked by Protestant Di-
 vines, contrary to what *Mr. Stilling.* would make us
 believe, *viz.* That all the Protestant Churches thought
 the form of Government indifferent. All which be-
 ing laid together, let any then judg what great advan-
 tage *Mr. Stilling's* cause hath received from this Testi-
 mony of *Zanchie.* Especially, if we consider with what
 Weapon *Zan.* defendeth this his Opinion, *viz.* ' That
 it was generally practised by the Ancient Church ;
 ' and he would not take upon him to disallow them :
 ' as may be seen in his Observations on Chap. 25. of
 ' his Confessions. We see he bringeth no better War-
 rant than the practice of Men who might, and did
 in many things err. But *Mr. Stilling.* telleth us
 of the same Opinion of *Zan. de 410 præc. loc. 4. qu.*
 2. p. 943, &c. and indeed he teacheth the same thing,

M

But

but with some advantage to our design : for, after he had made the ordinary Officers to be of three sorts, viz. Pastors, and Doctors, and Ruling-Elders (whose Office he proveth from Scripture, and asserteth as the Opinion of the Reformed Divines generally) and Deacons : and had proved at length p. 950, 951, 952. Presbyters and Bishops to be the same in Scripture : He sheweth p. 952, 953. That in after-Ages one of the Presbyters was set over the rest : but addeth, to qualifie it p. 953. *‘ Idcirco damnari hac, pie vetustatis ordinatio & consuetudo non potest, modo plus sibi authoritatis non usurpet Episcopus quam habent reliqui Ministri, ut recte monet Hieronymus.* Here he overturneth all Mr. Stilling’s design, for such a Bishop is but a meer President. He thinks he hath gain’d another Testimony from M. Bucer, whom Zan. in those his observations citeth : but Mr. Stilling. hath not told us wherein Bucer speaketh to his purpose ; wherefore take this account of Bucer’s Opinion out of Zanch. He citeth two large Testimonies of Bucer : the first is out of his Commentary on the *Ephes.* where he speaketh of seven kinds of Teaching, viz. ‘ By Reading, Interpretation, Instruction, (*Doctrina*) Exhortation, Catechisms, Disputing, private Admonition : ‘ from which he saith, That in the Ancient Church ‘ they brought in seven kinds of Teachers. Now what is this to the Parity or imparity of Ministers ? He speaketh nothing here of setting a Lord-Bishop over his Brethren, as a thing lawfully practised in the ancient Church. Yea, if we consider his Discourse well, we shall find that these were not divers Offices, but the work of the Pastors divided among more, where there were many Officers in one Church : yet so as all might exercise all these Duties ; and so here is no multiplication of Offices beyond Christ’s Institution. Though I do not deny, that this distributing of the work of Ministers did afterwards be-
gin

gin to be looked upon, as making several orders of Officers: but this he doth not approve of. The second Testimony of *Bucer* is out of his *de Discipl. Clerical*. The sum of which is this (for the words are too long to be transcribed) That in the Ancient Church they set up a Bishop among the Presbyters; '*Ut Consul inter Senatores*, (this is devolving their Power into his hands, which Mr. *Still.* pleadeth for) That these Bishops and Presbyters did meet when occasion required, in Synods; that one was over the Synod to convocate and moderate it, (this is not to have Jurisdiction over the rest) who was called *Metropolitan*, from the chief City, where he used to reside: then over the *Metropolitans* were set up *Patriarchs* (but behold how careful he is to protest against imparity, as to Jurisdiction) of whom he saith, '*His tamen Primatibus Episcopis nihil omnino juris erat in alios Episcopos aliasve Ecclesias, ultra quod dixi cuique Metropolitae in Ecclesiis atque Episcopos suae provinciae*: Which, we took notice before, was to convocate and moderate the Synod. At last he sheweth how among these *Patriarchs* the Bishop of *Rome* was set up as Chief: and then how all good Order went to ruine. Now let this Testimony be considered, and we shall hope for more advantage by it, than Mr. *Still.* could expect. From it we draw these two Conclusions: 1. That *Bucer* looked upon setting up a Precedent over Presbyters, as the greatest length that the Primitive Church did or could go towards the making of imparity among Ministers. 2. That even this their practice, though not unlawful in it self; yet is so inconvenient, that it was the Method and Mean that Antichrist got into his Chair by.

Scñ. 5. He cometh next to the *French Divines*, and beginneth with *Fregeville*, whose Testimony we think not worth the Answering, seeing as Mr. *Still.* confesseth, he was Episcopal. His opinion did not suit well with the principles of that Church he lived in, as we shall see after. The

next is *Blondel*, that learned writer for Presbyters, as he is called : whose words cited by Mr. *Still*. are not at all to the purpose ; as any may see at first view ; seeing he saith no more, but, that it is in the Churches Power to make a perpetual Precedent or not. For *Bochartus* his opinion, that neither *Presbyterialis* nor *Episcopalis ordo* is *juris divini* : if he mean the difference between them in jurisdiction, and not only in Precedency : I see not how it can be defended, and not having his Book I cannot determine how consistent it is with his own principles. For *Amiraldus*, whom he bringeth next, his design of Union with the *Lutherans*, I believe, did either stretch his opinion or made him stretch his affections to an excess of condescendency ; which cannot be excused but from his good Intention.

Sec̃. 6. Our Author cometh next to those who look on Parity as the Primitive Form, and yet allow Episcopacy as a very Lawful and usefull constitution. Concerning these, I premise 2 general Remarques. 1. That what these worthy Divines say to this purpose is to be understood, not of *Episcopus Princeps*, but *Præses*, according to that distinction very common among them. This we must hold as only consistent with their principles, till the contrary be proved out of their own writings. 2. That many things said by them to this purpose were the over reaches of their desire to be one with them who differed from them in this, but agreed in most things as the *Lutherans* and some English Divines : they did often (as *Smẽt.* saith of *Spanhem* to the same purpose, p. 65.) deliver a Complement rather than their Judgment. But to come to particulars : he beginneth with *Cracanthorp*, who excuseth all the Reformed Churches from *Aerianism*, because they held not Imparity to be unlawful. But this man was a Son of the Church of *England* (as they speak) and wrote in her defence against *Ant. de Domin.* wherefore his Testimony of the opinion of the Reformed Churches is not to be taken, being willing to have them all think as he did. They are better defend-

ed from siding with *Aerius* by *Smeēt.* p. 79. where it is proved, that *Aerius* was condemned for his Arianism and other Errors, but not for holding the Divine Right of Parity: and that *Jerome*, *Augustus*, *Sedulius*, *Primatius*, *Crisostome*, *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophylact*, were of the same opinion with *Aerius* in this. Next he bringeth the *Augustane* confession: of the Testimony of which I have these 3 things to say. 1. This was not a confession of them who are ordinarily called the Reformed Churches; but of the *Lutherans*; for at the same meeting at *Augusta* did *Zuinglius* and the *Helvetians* give in their confession apart, by themselves: wherefore it is no wonder, if these worthy men, who were a reforming, but had not attained to that pitch of it which others had, did retain some small tincture of the way according to which they had been bred in this point. 2. *Luther* himself was not well pleased with this confession, as appeareth by the Relation of *Pezelius*, who (*Mellific. Histor. par. 3. p. 336.*) saith thus. ‘*Autor vero confessionis cum Luthero qui in Pontificiis concessum Stomachabatur confessionem rudem magis magisque, ne spiritum extinguere, limabat, poliebat, et duriuscula fermentumque vetus redolentia expurgabat: via enim iusti sicut aurora lucere pergit usque ad meridiem, id quod ex ipsa apologia apparet.*’ 3. All that is said in this confession, is no more but an expression of their desire to conform and condescend to the Papists in the Primitive order of the Church: but this was no more but the Precedency of Bishops; the confession speaketh not of the Lordly power of Bishops as it then stood; that they would yield to that: so that even the furthest they go, in their complemental condescendency, doth not help *Mr. Still’s* cause; who pleadeth for the sole jurisdiction of Bishops as lawful.

Seēt. 7. In the next place, he is not ashamed to force *Calvin* to speak for the lawfulness of Episcopacy, which he would never comport with while he lived. He bringeth *his Instit. lib. 4. c. 4. seēt. 1. & 4.* in both which Sections

he alledgeth no more out of him but this ; That the ancient Bishops had almost nothing in their Canons which was beside the Word of God : and that they used no other form of Governing the Church, than was prescribed in the Word. What doth this help his Cause ? The Ancient Bishops in *Calvins* judgment, were no more but *Præsides*. These, he saith, were not constituted beside the Word of God. This is nothing to the scope of our Authors Discourse. I hope after to shew that *Calvin* was far from his mind. At present let it suffice to observe, that the very words cited by *Mr. Still.* do make against him. For when *Calvin* saith, '*Si rem omisso vocabulo, intuemur, reperiemus veteres Episcopos non aliam regendæ ecclesiæ formam voluisse fingere ab ea, quam deus verbo suo præscripsit* : It is not evident, that he supposeth God in his Word to have prescribed a form of Church-Government. And 2dly, That he asserteth, that the Ancient Bishops (if we look to the thing, and do not understand the name [*Bishop*] as now it is used for the Prelate) did stick close to this Form ; What could be more directly against *Mr. Still.* ? Neither is he more happy in the citing of *Beza* for him : for *Beza's* distinction of Bishop is well known, '*in Divinus*, i.e. Presbyter '*Humanus*, i.e. &c. a President or constant Moderator ; & '*Diabolicus*, i. e. a Prelate with sole jurisdiction. The indifference of the 2d he asserteth, and will not prescribe the Form used at *Geneva* (which was without such a fixed President) to other Churches : but what is this to the purpose ? It is a pity to see a Learned Man at so much pains and lose his labour. It being so as hath been shewed. *Mr. Still.* doth foully misrepresent the state of the Controversy about Church-Government, that was between the Church of *England* and of *Geneva* in *Queen Elizabeth's* time : it was not, as he alledgeth, whether Parity or Episcopacy were more convenient : but whether Prelacy putting sole jurisdiction in the hand of a Bishop, or giving him power over his Brethren, were lawful.

Señ. 8. Next he bringeth *George Prince of Anhalt, Luther, Melancton, and Calvin*, professing their readiness to submit to Bishops, if they would do the duty of Bishops. All which amounts to no more than this, That if Bishops would keep within bounds, not usurp Authority over their Brethren, nor use it to the destruction of Religion, they might be born with; but this maketh nothing for the lawfulness of Prelacy, which these Men did ever detest. For *Jacobus Heerbrandus*, I am not acquainted with his Principles, nor his Book. *Hemingius* (who cometh next) speaketh expressly of *disparis dignitatis ordines*, not *authoritatis*; and so cometh not up to the thing in Question. For *Zepper* his judgment of the necessity of a Superintendent, it destroyeth our Authors Hypothesis; for if it be necessary, it is not indifferent. If in any case such a thing be necessary, it is in that case lawful, (*nam necessitas quicquid coegit defendit*) in other cases it is unlawful. What he saith of Bishops in some *Lutheran Churches*, as *Sweden, Denmark, &c.* doth not weigh with us, knowing that they err in greater matters also. What he saith of other Churches that have their *Praepositi* or *Seniores* enjoying the same power with Ancient Bishops; proveth nothing of the lawfulness of Prelacy; We think their way lawful: and whether it be convenient to them, or not, we judg not; but to us, sad experience hath proved it most inconvenient. The next thing that he consisteth on, *viz.* Episcopal Divines, holding Episcopacy not necessary, it doth not concern us to Answer, and so we see to what amounteth the strength of these Testimonies, which he would fright us with, as if all Men were of his judgment.

Señ. 9. Having now seen of what force are our Authors Witnesses, brought for the indifferency of the Form of Church-Government; let us see if there can be more pregnant Authority brought for the divine Right of it. I do not question but many sheets may be filled with pertinent

Citations to this purpose, by one better stored with Writings of our Reformed Divines, and having leisure to search them. I shall give some instances, such as my poor Library doth afford, both of Churches and of particular Divines. And before the Restorers of the Truth, I shall mention those famous Conservators of it in the darkest times of Antichristianism, the *Waldenses*, whom some of our Divines call *Majores Nostros*: their Opinion in this may be seen in *Waldensia Confes. Taboritarum* per Joa. Lukawitz. cap. 3. p. 5. *Lex evangelica Jesu Christi-- per se sufficientissima ad regimen Ecclesiae militantis*, & c. 14. p. 32. *Nos qui pro lege liberrima Jesu Christi per se sufficienti, ad regimen Ecclesiae militantis, sine Ceremoniis Legis veteris & ritibus humanis post adjectis, scientes, quia securissimum est & optimum Magisterium Ecclesiae primitivae, quam regebant Apostoli, actus imitari.* We see here the sufficiency of Scripture for Church-Government asserted, and that without new Laws or humane devices; which could not be if the particular Form were not determined in it, but left to Mens devising: Also, that Apostolick practice is in this a Rule to us; both which militate against Mr. Stilling's Discourse. I shall next bring the opinion of the French and the Dutch Churches, held forth in their Confessions: which I have out of *Smeđ. sect. 14.* The French Church Artic. 29. 30. speaketh thus: *Credimus veram Ecclesiam gubernari debere, eam politiam quam dominus noster Jesus Christus sancivit* (then it may not be such as Men think fit, nor is it indifferent) *ita, viz. aut sui in ea Pastores, Presbyteri, sive seniores & Diaconi* (then Christs institution is against Bishops, seeing he appointeth the rest, and leaveth them out) *ut doctrinae puritas retineatur. Credimus omnes Pastores ubicunque collocati sint, eadem & aequali potestate inter se esse praeditos* (then there can be no imparity of power) *sub uno illo capite & solo universali Episcopo Jesu Christi.* The Dutch Church, Art. 30. thus: *Credimus veram hanc Ecclesiam debere regi ac gubernari, spiritali illa politia quam nos deus ipse in verbo suo edocuit, ita ut sint in ea Pastores ac Ministri, qui pure*

& concionentur & sacramenta administrent, sint etiam seniores & Diaconi, qui Ecclesie senatum constituent; ut his veluti mediis vera Religio conservari, hominesque vitiis dediti spiritualiter corripi, & emendari possint. Tunc enim rite & ordinate omnia fiunt in Ecclesia, cum viri fideles & pii ad ejus gubernationem deliguntur, juxta Pauli præscriptum 1 Tim. 3: ceterum ubicunque locorum sint verbi Dei Ministri, eandem atque æqualem omnes habent tum potestatem tum auctoritatem: ut qui sint æquæ omnes Christi unici illius universalis Episcopi & capitis Ecclesie Ministri. What hath ever been the opinion of the Church of Scotland about the Divine Right of Presbyterial Government, is so well known, that I need not mention it: also what hath been the judgment of the Presbyterian Ministers of England, both in the National Synod of famous memory, and the Provincial Assembly of London, who have written for the *jus divinum* of it.

Sec̃. 10. To this Truth also, the famous Professors of London bear their joint Testimony. *Synops. Pur. Theol. Disp.* 48. *Thef.* 23. 'Nec tamen propterea concedimus à solo aliquo Episcopo, sive Romano, sive Engobino, ex motu proprio aut plenaria auctoritate, ut loquimur, hanc potestatem posse vendicari: sed rectorum ac Presbyterorum Ecclesie, concilium, totiusq; adeo Ecclesie aut apertum, aut tacitum consensum, adhibendum esse; ex præscripto Christi ac purioris Ecclesie praxi asserimus. And this they prove, *Thef.* 24. Because that [Tell the Church] cannot be understood of one Bishop. Calvin is clear for us; for he maketh the Officers of the Church to be by Christs Institution; and sheweth who they are that he hath Instituted. *Instit. lib.* 4. c. 3. *sec̃.* 4. Also, c. 4. *sec̃.* 1. He sheweth how in the Primitive Church, they studied carefully to adhere to God's Institution in the Government of the Church. And on *Phil.* 1:1. reproving the Usurpation of Bishops, he saith, 'Perinde ac si non omnes Presbyteri Collegæ essent ad eandem vocati functionem, unus sibi, prætextu novæ appellationis dominium in alios arripuit.

Señ. 11. I close with a short Answer (such as it defer-
 veth) to his last Assault ; which is p. 416. 'If Prudence
 ' must be used in settling Church-Government, as he saith
 ' is confessed by *Independents* in their Elective Synods : by
 ' *Presbyterians* in their subordination of Courts, Classi-
 ' cals : Episcopal Men in several things. *Ans.* All
 this is nothing of the particular Form of Government,
 Parity or imparity, and so nothing to the purpose. We
 absolutely deny that That is to be settled by Prudence ; but
 by the Institution of Christ ; though many Circumstances
 in Government must be determined by Prudence, guided
 by Scripture-light. For his advice in order to Peace, it
 containeth many good things ; yet cannot we fully close
 with it, till he establish on better grounds than we have yet
 seen, the Basis of it, viz. The indifferency of the particular
 Form of Church-Government.

F I N I S.

defer-
dence
faith
s: by
ffical
f. All
ment
We
s: but
stances
guided
nce, it
close
ve yet
icular